DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 351 279 SO 022 756

AUTHOR Riley, G. Michael
TITLE Area and Ethnic Studies Program Review in the State University System of Florida.
INSTITUTION State Univ. System of Florida, Tallahassee.
REPORT NO BOR-91-5
PUB DATE Sep 92
NOTE 88p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Area Studies; *Ethnic Studies; Higher Education; International Studies; Outcomes of Education; *Program Evaluation; State Surveys; *State Universities
IDENTIFIERS *State University System of Florida

ABSTRACT

This report presents an evaluation of area studies and ethnic studies programs offered at institutions in the State University System (SUS) of Florida. The programs covered include domestically and internationally oriented interdisciplinary programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The internationally oriented programs are Latin American and Caribbean studies (five campuses), African studies (two campuses), Asian studies (three campuses), Soviet (Russian) and East European studies (three campuses), Jewish (Judaic) studies (two campuses), Greek studies (one campus), Canadian studies (one campus), and West European studies (one campus). The domestically oriented programs are American studies (three campuses), African-American studies (three campuses), and Florida studies (one campus). Seven of the nine SUS campuses feature one or more of these programs; the campuses are: The University of Florida, The Florida State University, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, University of South Florida, Florida Atlantic University, University of Central Florida, and Florida International University. The report provides a summary of evaluatory findings and recommendations for the elimination, sustainment, or qualitative advancement of each program. Overall, it was found that a number of the area and ethnic programs within the State University System should be eliminated and that SUS's commitment to internationalizing its curriculum is not being realized. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: SO

In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the Clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. HE

ED351279

AREA AND ETHNIC STUDIES PROGRAM REVIEW

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

JACK RICHARDSON

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA

SEPTEMBER 1992

BOR 91-5

SO 022 756

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AREA AND ETHNIC STUDIES PROGRAM REVIEW IN THE STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA

Dr. G. Michael Riley, Dean
College of Humanities
Ohio State University

September 1992

BOR 91-5

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

1991-92 Program Review Methodology
Area Studies as a Discipline
Area Studies in the SUS
Recommendations

The University of Florida 11

The Florida State University 31

Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University 42

University of South Florida 45

Florida Atlantic University 53

University of Central Florida 59

Florida International University 71

Appendices 77

A. Resume of Lead Consultant 79

B. List of Consultants 85

C. University Coordinators 89

i

Introduction

Area studies programming in the State University System (SUS) of Florida includes domestically and internationally oriented interdisciplinary programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The internationally oriented programs are Latin American and Caribbean studies (five campuses), African studies (two campuses) Asian studies (three campuses), Soviet (Russian) and East European studies (three campuses), Jewish (Judaic) studies (two campuses), Greek studies (one campus), Canadian studies (one campus) and West European studies (one campus); the domestically-oriented programs are American studies (three campuses), African-American studies (three campuses), Florida studies (one campus). Offering the largest number of programs is the University of Florida, offering no programs are the Universities of North and West Florida.

Extensively developed and distinguished are three of these programs, the University of Florida's Latin American and African Centers, and Florida International University's Latin American and Caribbean Center. Reputable is the University of Florida's American Studies program and very promising is Florida Atlantic University's Latin American program.

Virtually untenable are the University of Florida's Soviet and East European Studies and its West European Studies programs; the University of South Florida's African and African-American Studies program; Florida State University's Latin American and Caribbean Studies program; and the University of Central Florida's Soviet Studies, and its Canadian Studies programs. Moribund is the University of Florida's Afro-American Studies program.

Overall, the SUS of Florida's commitment to instill values, and to internationalizing its curriculum (State University System of Florida Master Plan 1988-89-1992-93) is not being realized. It is weak in area studies and, therefore, in international studies. A majority of the System's 180,000 students are not offered (much less required to gain) a reasonably broad understanding of international affairs, not to mention important domestic ethnic, racial and cultural matters. This has serious implications for the System's intellectual future.

1991-92 Program Review Methodology

The 1991-92 State University System of Florida's Area Studies Program Review was conducted by a team of ten consultants on seven of the System's nine campuses. Studied were 25 discreet programs. This report provides a summary of the consultants' evaluatory findings and their recommendations for the elimination, sustainment, or qualitative advancement of those programs. Also treated is the System's overall engagement with internationalization, and with diversity -- ethnic, cultural, and racial -- in its academic programming.

Self-studies of each of the programs evaluated were developed by the faculty and administrative officers of each during the 1990-91 academic year. Data concerning, each program was compiled by the State University System's Board of Regents Office of Program Review, which initiated and organized the review. Institutional site visits were organized by each of the universities involved in the review. Institutional consultants developed reports for each program considered during the late fall and early winter of 1990-91. The lead consultant developed this report out of the consultant's site visit and institutional program self-study reports and related documents.

Area Studies as a Discipline

Originating in Classics and Oriental Studies which brought literature, language, history, art history, philosophy, archaeology, and geography together in a multidisciplinary, multi-methodological approach to the study of societies located in broadly defined geographical regions (Oriental Studies originally extended geographically from Turkey and Persia [Iran-Iraq] to China and Japan) and/or over a broadly defined time interval (the Classics from 776 B.C. or earlier to 400 A.D. and later) area studies today remains a multidisciplinary, multi-methodological approach to the study of societies and societal activities and attitudes also defined geographically and extending through broadly defined time intervals. Programming in area studies is today further defined as a domestic (internal societal groupings based upon gender, race, cultural characteristics or ethnicity) and international (external societal groupings).

Literature, language, history, political science, anthropology, and philosophy remain the cornerstones of today's area studies,

but study in economics; sociology; political, health, natural and physical sciences; journalism; music; folklore; and other disciplinary areas are often included. Area studies ordinarily are organized around an administrative support structure (varying in title and form from institute and center to department and school) which provides leadership, student direction, and financial support, and serves as the agency through which instructional and research initiatives as well as the acquisition of funding and moral support for both are defined and pursued. Area studies programming provides the substantive core of international study and related developmental work as well as the study of domestic pluralism and societal identity.

International intercourse whether commercial, diplomatic, military, or other depends upon area studies expertise as does significant domestic socio-political and economic activity. Troublesome today are the challenges to successful area studies programming posed by over-specialization -- disciplinary and methodological -- in academically defined study and knowledge areas (a circumstance directly related to the "knowledge explosion" of the last three decades and the technological revolution in communication, data accumulation, etc. which facilitated it) and periodically excessive parochialism in national and local policies governing higher education and research and development whether linked to higher education or the other dimensions of both the private and public sectors of our society. Equally troublesome is the tendency in too many institutions serving higher education toward concentration on international developmental work or highly specialized research and graduate study at the expense of undergraduate "core" programming in area studies. National and even local policy and support agencies have encouraged that concentration with funding and recognition initiatives.

Area studies will be redefined in the context of the challenges mentioned in the foregoing paragraphs over the next two decades or so, and, barring some unforeseen and monumental change in the doings of humanity, will assume increasing importance in public policy and, therefore, in higher education. It is for those reasons that the SUS of Florida should attend the following report and recommendations.

Area Studies in the State University System

Area studies programming in the SUS of Florida includes domestically and internationally oriented interdisciplinary programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The internationally oriented programs are Latin American and Caribbean studies (five campuses), African studies (two

campuses) Asian studies (three campuses), Soviet (Russian) and East European studies (three campuses), Jewish (Judaic) studies (two campuses), Greek studies (one campus), Canadian studies (one campus) and West European studies (one campus); the domestically-oriented programs are American studies (three campuses), African-American studies (three campuses), Florida studies (one campus). Offering the largest number of programs is the University of Florida, offering no programs are the Universities of North and West Florida.

Extensively developed and distinguished are three of these programs, the University of Florida's Latin American and African Centers, and Florida International University's Latin American and Caribbean Center. Reputable is the University of Florida's American Studies program and very promising is Florida Atlantic University's Latin American program.

At the time of the site visits, virtually untenable were the University of Florida's Soviet and East European Studies and its West European Studies programs; the University of South Florida's African and African-American Studies program; Florida State University's Latin American and Caribbean Studies program; and the University of Central Florida's Soviet Studies, and its Canadian Studies programs. It should be noted, however, that much progress has been made to revitalize the University of South Florida's African and African-American Studies program. Moribund is the University of Florida's Afro-American Studies programs.

Overall, the SUS of Florida's commitment to instill values and to internationalizing its curriculum (State University System of Florida Master Plan 1988-89-1992-93) is not being realized. It is weak in area studies and, therefore, in international studies. There is, by way of example, no program in Latino Studies despite a 12% population of Latinos in Florida. Admittedly superficial, but nonetheless revealing, is the survey of its 1990-91 program and course offerings catalog materials conducted by the program review's lead consultant. That survey reveals few courses and programs throughout the curricula of the nine Universities which serve area studies. Exceptions are those of the University of Florida and Florida International University. The more extensive program review self-studies and campus consultant reports unfortunately substantiate that superficial conclusion. A majority of the System's 180,000 students are not offered (much less required to gain) even a reasonably broad understanding of international affairs, not to mention important domestic ethnic, racial and cultural matters. Serious in implication for the System's intellectual future are the astonishing lack of both, especially when that lack is linked to an apparent neglect of the arts and sciences in general and the humanities, the arts and the social sciences in particular.

Recommendations

1. The officers of the State University System and the chief executive and academic officers of its constituent universities should move immediately to an evaluatory study of the activities and programming beyond area studies which provide engagement with and an understanding of international affairs and with domestic cultural, ethnic, gender, and racial pluralism. The findings of that study (or studies) coupled with those in this report should form the basis for extensive discussion and planning.

Parenthetically, not all of the criticism in this or any other evaluation is in each and every dimension justified and so should be laid to rest. Others, as validated, should be addressed perhaps through a process such as that outlined in some of the following paragraphs. Acknowledged, in addition, by the Review consultants is the tendency for evaluations such as theirs to be circumscribed by "what is" rather than "what might be" with the first determining "what should be" rather than a joining of the first and the second. Exemplary are the programmatic formats generally employed over the last five or more decades in area studies (and other interdisciplinary configurations). They may not serve the purposes for which they were designed as effectively as they should. Of interest and concern in that regard are the impact of contemporary technology (and that taking shape) on communication and information systems; the "center" or "center-like" administrative structure for programming at all levels, i.e., that structure seems to work well at the graduate level and in research but works much less well at the undergraduate level and in instruction, etc.

2. The SUS should establish a long term (ten year) flexible incentive program (Florida SUS-21: Internationalism and Diversity, or some such title) directed at the qualitative enrichment of existing, effective campus programming in area studies; at vitalizing (where appropriate) promising but ineffective existing programming; at stimulating new programming as appropriate; and, particularly, at orienting its dynamic, special, and powerful socio-political and intellectual resources toward provision for global life in the next century.

The incentive program should be funded at a level of say $250,000 annually as soon as possible but preferably beginning in 1993-94 at the latest and rising incrementally to a level of $500,000 or so annually by 1996-97, and continuing at that level through 2003-04 or 2004-05. Required for allocations from these funds to campuses should be campus matches (real,

new outlays) on a minimal one to one and, preferably, a maximal two to one ratio. Program guidelines should address qualitative advancement of existing programming; effective campus planning for and commitments to area and international studies and activities; and internationalization of campus curricula in general but especially in the arts and sciences. The guts of programming -- faculty expertise, library resources, operating funds, administrative and clerical staff, and housing should dominate incentive allocations.

3. The System incentive program should be accompanied by a resource sharing and enrichment initiative aimed at electronically shared library, museum and other materials; electronic access to comparable materials worldwide; and faculty-student expertise advancement. The latter might take the form, for example, of annual Florida Asian, Latin American, African-American and other conferences, each hosted on a rotating basis by campuses with established degree programs and funded modestly by a campus and System sharing plan, i.e., $5,000-$10,000 annually for each conference to cover travel and related costs. Featured in such conferencing should be Florida System faculty and, most important, student research results. As one model, the Latin American programs at UF and FIU currently co-sponsor the Florida Consortium in Latin American Studies which holds an annual colloquium for Latin Americanists from Florida's universities and community colleges. Inclusion of limited outside expertise in such activities, in order to assure breadth of stimulation and evaluation, is advisable. Such an enterprise would cost less -- even at fifteen shared conferences a year -- and produce much greater and longer lasting results than, for example, all (and certainly any one) of the "Institutes" in the Bi-national Linkage Institute Program. The results so far of that program appear -- with a few exceptions -- to have been short term and relatively small.

4. With System inspired (if not provided) leadership, campus area studies administrators and faculty should design minimal criteria (curricula, faculty expertise, library, and operating support) for area studies undergraduate and graduate minor, certificate and degree programs for use in their development, evaluation and receipt of System incentive assistance. Minimal criteria for a minor program -- for example -- should include an eight semester equivalent competence in at least one foreign language, at least history, literature and a social science (economics, political science, sociology, anthropology) element(s) and preferably at least four among those. Desirable, in addition, are elements in the arts, philosophy and selected business, medical and other areas.

5. In cooperation with campus chief executive and academic officers a set of area studies priorities based upon System intellectual and socio-political values, realities and

aspirations should be defined every five years or so and should be utilized to inform any System incentive programs as well as campus specific program development. The present configuration of System programs suggests that present priorities are: Latin American, American, African, Asian, Eastern European and African-American studies.

6. As a postscript in placement, but by no means in terms of their concerns, all of the 1991-92 Program Review consultants found the dearth of adequate System programming in certain of the Area Studies particularly distressing. African-American Studies is limited to one underfunded and just barely functional program (Florida A&M University), one program undergoing revitalization (University of South Florida), and one collapsed program (University of Florida). Collectively the consultants urge the System and its several constituent parts to address that area immediately and as a high priority. In addition, the absence of Latino Studies has been previously noted.

INSTITUTIONAL REPORTS

The University of Florida

Area Studies in General

The genuine concern with area and international studies and with domestic diversity initiatives both intellectual and pragmatic, by the University of Florida's faculty and, especially, its administrative officers is impressive and highly commendable. The President, the Provost, and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences are interested in programming in those areas, are aware of the issues involved in sustaining that programming, and are seemingly committed to its advancement.

The recent appointment by the Provost of a Director of International Studies; the 1989 (August) campuswide workshop in "Excellence in International Education" sponsored by the Council on International Studies and Programs and the Graduate School; the seriousness and care with which the 1991-92 Program Review self studies were developed and its site visits were scheduled and conducted; and the general campus knowledge about and concern with, the 1986 BOR Program Review recommendations, all are illustrative of the University's commitment to international and domestic studies. Despite these very positive indicators which were evidenced in the consultants' thoughtful, candid and wide-ranging discussions with administrators, faculty, library staff and students, those discussions revealed several counter-balancing negative factors and circumstances.

Several of the area and ethnic studies programs appear both fiscally and morally neglected. Faculty in those programs feel they are not in touch with the University's leadership and express frustration over that lack of communication as well as any generally known and accepted plan or policies for program development, and the lack of investment (entire or partial) in several programs, and especially, faculty compensation (salaries). Faculty salaries are, on the whole, very low as compared with those of faculty in comparable research universities.

The Director of International Studies and Programs apparently has a mission which is almost exclusively managerial, i.e., assisting the Provost in integrating programs, and is not directed at nurturing faculty initiatives. It is not clear whether the 1989 "Excellence in International Education" workshop, the proceedings of which contain interesting and worthwhile proposals worthy of study and probable implementation, has made any impact on the University's programming. The 1986 BOR Program Review recommendations for the University's area and ethnic studies programs have in

several instances been taken very seriously, while in others they appear to have been ignored entirely. Essential library resources for area and ethnic studies have been either satisfactorily sustained or promisingly expanded in some instances, while in others they have been reduced or are being reduced.

The University's current financial crisis has produced uncertainties and dislocations which are affecting faculty, student and staff morale. The not unfamiliar debate about the roles of campus academic programming and overseas project activities in determining University funding allocations, commitment, etc., is very much a part of faculty discussion about area studies. Most of those associated with the first appear convinced that they are valued less and, therefore, receive less and are less influential than those associated with the second. (The consultants heard little from, and saw even less about, those associated with the second.) Typically, the debate pits faculty in the social sciences, the arts, the humanities and some in the sciences against others in the sciences and in professional programs. The two should be loosely linked administratively and should be mutually supportive (attempts to link them closely are likely to fail). No overseas project work which does not advance the research and instructional mission of the University should be undertaken. Advancement in that context is taken by the consultants to mean lasting beyond the term of the project -- long-term enrichment of the University faculty and student activities. It is clear that the University's present overseas projects do not enrich its academic area and international studies programming with the consistency they should. Overseas projects should be "taxed" to support the academic expertise base which is so critical to local, state and national overseas interests.

The University of Florida boasts a broad range of undergraduate degree and certificate, and graduate degree area studies programs which are offered through ten operational agencies. Of the ten, two -- the Centers for Latin American and for African Studies -- are of international and national stature. Four enjoy regional or statewide prominence, the Centers for Greek and for Jewish Studies, and the Florida and American Studies programs. All but the last of these have been successful in garnering extra-University funding and the first four are clearly the University's strongest and most strongly supported programs. The American Studies program like the East Asian, Russian and East European, West European and Afro-American Studies programs have not attracted extra-University support to any real degree and are receiving minimal, if any real, administrative support as programs. The first two, American Studies and East Asian Studies, are considerably stronger academically than the Florida Studies and the Russian

and East European, West European and Afro-American Studies programs.

Underdeveloped among these are the Russian and East European, West European and Afro-American Studies programs and seriously neglected is the last. The program review consultants find that the University has allowed the Afro-American program to fall fallow. That neglect contradicts the University's genuine affirmation of gender, cultural, ethnic and racial diversity in other areas. It flies in the face of the historical importance of Florida's African-American peoples who today comprise over 13% of the state's total population and some 6% of the University's undergraduate population. Moreover, recent projections indicate that by 1995 African-Americans will constitute about 17.5% of Florida's college-age population; clearly a vibrant Afro-American Studies program should be a University priority.

Area Studies In Particular

Center for Latin American Studies

The University of Florida's Center for Latin American Studies is a very impressive, internationally recognized Center; one of the very finest Latin American Studies programs in the country. The faculty and facilities are excellent. The program is well-defined and ably led. It sustains strong connections with units throughout the University and with other Centers in the United States, Latin America, and Europe. It also maintains unusual (in their number and character), impressive, connections with a number of other Florida SUS institutions. Included are innovative linkages and interdisciplinary collaboration in tropical conservation and development, biology, medicine, architectural reconstruction, and population and social change.

I. Program

The Center's programming includes a rich array of varied offerings and a strong language component involving four languages of which two, Spanish and Portuguese, are central. The Haitian Creole courses enjoy a strong and growing constituency and should be sustained. The Aymara courses are the weakest among the language offerings. Although in the present fiscal circumstance, it may be difficult, if not impossible, to put Aymara on a firmer footing, consideration should be given to doing so over the next four to five years.

II. Faculty and III. Students

The enthusiasm and commitment of the Center's faculty and students are impressive. Enrollment in its programming is qualitatively and quantitatively impressive. Similarly, the quality and quantity of the faculty's contribution to scholarship are exceedingly impressive as are their numbers and intellectual and disciplinary diversity. Two program faculty vacancies in history and literature should be filled as promptly as possible. Three core faculty were lost during the 1991-92 academic year.

The current administrative structure with the Center reporting to the Provost's Office is anomalous within the University, but virtually all concerned agree that the present arrangement works well; there is no reason to change it.

IV. Facilities and Resources

It is important to report that the Latin American Collection of the Library has lost two professional staff members. Aside from the continuing need for sustained library acquisitions and the addition to the Center Staff of clerical assistance (a part-time secretary), the facilities and resources (inclusive of the U.S. Department of Education, N.D.E.A. Title VI funding enjoyed by the Center as one of ten or so national resource centers for Latin American Studies) supporting the Center are adequate to its needs.

V. 1986 BOR Program Review Recommendations

The University and the Center have fully met the 1986 BOR Program Review recommendations.

VI. Conclusions

A. Strengths and Concerns

The quality of its faculty, leadership and students comprise the Center's great strengths and great strengths they are. The consultants' primary concerns are with the filling of <u>two</u>, important Center faculty positions now vacant (history and literature), a solid commitment to sustaining the quality of its library acquisitions and staffing, and a University commitment to the long-term design the Center's leadership has outlined for further enhancement of the Center's faculty and student expertise.

B. Recommendations

1. The Center's two faculty vacancies (19th and 20th Century Latin American history and Latin American literature) should be opened to recruitment and filled immediately (or, if absolutely necessary, one should be opened to recruitment during 1992-93 and the other during 1993-94). Both are central to the continued viability of the Center's internationally renowned programming.

2. Additional secretarial assistance in the form of at least a part-time secretary should be provided the Center immediately (on a temporary basis for 1992-93 and permanent thereafter if necessary).

3. The visionary, long-term design for the Center's qualitative advancement enunciated by the Center's exceptionally able administrative and faculty leadership group and the Program Review Campus Consultant should be embraced as a solid long-term commitment by the University's officers. That design includes the following elements which are framed within a consultant proposed timetable.

a. 1992-93

1) Recruitment and appointments as stipulated in #1 and 2 above.

2) Strengthening and diversifying the Center's undergraduate (B.A.) program and elevating it to the qualitative strength of its nationally recognized MALAS (M.A.) graduate program.

3) Evaluation of the Aymara language-culture program by the Center and the University with the intention of strengthening it over time.

b. 1993-94

1) Recruitment and appointments as stipulated in #1 above.

2) A substantial increase in the level of Center graduate student teaching and research stipends (they are at present lagging behind national levels).

c. 1994-95

1) Allocation to the Center of a position for a faculty appointment in international macro-economics and recruitment for that position.

2) Enhancement of the Center's outreach to the University's Latino student population.

d. 1995-96

1) Allocation to the Center of a position for a faculty appointment in anthropology and recruitment for that position.

2) Evaluation of the Center's Haitian Creole language program with the intention of defining its long-term value to Center programming.

e. 1996-97

1) Allocation to the Center of a position for a faculty appointment in biology.

4. Sustainment of support for the Center's supporting library facilities, staffing and acquisitions budget.

5. Strengthening of the Center's ties with the College of Business Administration including planning for mutually beneficial faculty appointments.

Center for African Studies

The University of Florida's African Studies program is vibrant and dynamic. It ranked fifth in the last national competition for U.S. Department of Education funding under Title VI of the Higher Education Act. The addition of some fifteen core faculty including internationally recognized figures between 1988 and 1991 substantively strengthened and expanded an already well-developed base in anthropology, history, languages, and political science. The graduate students attracted by these scholars are, almost without exception, of outstanding quality as is evident in the nationally competitive dissertation research grants they are winning. Equally compelling evidence of the excellence of Florida's Africanists are the important contributions to knowledge which they are issuing in an increasing volume.

I. Program

The Center offers both undergraduate and graduate certificate programs which are comprised of courses in some eighteen departments, four Center-sponsored core courses, and creative study abroad options in Tanzania and Nigeria. Its courses are in high demand, especially those treating African languages taught by the Department of Asian and African Languages. The

University needs to support the Center in increasing the range of languages which it can teach, and the Center needs to bring student expectations into line with its ability to meet them, i.e., there are hundreds of African languages, therefore, focusing on those most germane to the Center's cognate strengths is essential.

The Center is nationally recognized for its enviable Carter Lecture Series and its programming in food and resource economics, law and governance, and environmental sciences.

II. Faculty

The quality of its faculty is an outstanding feature of the Center and one of its major contributions to the University as a whole, The SUS and the Academy at large. The faculty is, with no glaring exceptions, fully engaged in teaching, research and service. Faculty morale is generally high as concerns the Center to which they are especially loyal. They are concerned, however, about the impact of the present fiscal crisis on their salaries, on research and administrative support for their work and that of their graduate students, as well as on the library, the last being central to all that they do.

III. Students

The Center's primary student enrollment is at the graduate level. Center graduate student morale is high and loyalty to the Center is strong. That student group is, however, anxious about the institution's ability to sustain the support they need, (a concern not reflected in conversations with the faculty) essentially graduate student teaching positions and research fellowships. There may be a communication problem in that area which should be addressed by the faculty.

Undergraduate student enrollment in Center programs needs strengthening. The Center should revitalize its undergraduate African Studies Certificate program.

IV. Facilities and Resources

The University's African library resources are good and outstandingly well-managed. However, for the current year the Africana bibliographer's acquisitions budget was reduced from $60,000 to $42,000. Effective sustainment of the Center's present programming and of its national competitiveness, requires restoration of the 1990-91 acquisitions budget of $60,000. Space assigned to the Center appears adequate for its needs. However, its administrative support personnel and its

operating budgets are incommensurate with the Center's University role, not to mention its position as a nationally competitive leader in African studies. The Center's current USPS position, occupied by an office manager, should be upgraded to a level which reflects the experience and competence required of its incumbent. Over the next three years, two secretarial positions fully supported by state funds should be added to the Center's administrative staff. The Center's operating budget should be increased to at least $20,000 per year.

V. 1986 BOR Program Review Recommendations

The University has successfully addressed the most essential of the recommendations of the 1986 program review. It has met the faculty appointment recommendations, and it met a part (appointment of an Associate Director) of the infrastructure and institutional support recommendations.

The Africana library acquisition budgets were increased substantially (until the present year) but funds have been drastically reduced and other infrastructural issues have not been addressed. Finally, the 1986 BOR Program Review recommendations treating the desirability of the state's making better use of special resources which the Center represents have not been realized.

VI. Conclusions

A. Strengths and Concerns

The Center's principal strengths are the quality of its faculty, the vigor and vision of the Center's leadership, the quality of its graduate students, and its enviable national and international reputation. The consultants' concerns include the lack of adequate infrastructural support for the Center, the narrowness of its language offerings, and the uncertainties and present level of its library acquisitions funding.

B. Recommendations

1. Restoration as promptly as possible of the library acquisition budget established for Africana materials to the 1990-91 level of $60,000 per year.

2. Strengthening the Center's administrative infrastructure by: upgrading the office manager's position, adding two full-time secretarial positions over the next three years, and increasing, as soon as possible, the Center's operating expense budget to a minimum level of $20,000 per year.

3. Increasing the Center's budget for graduate teaching assistant salaries by approximately $20,000 over the next three years to provide for additional African language course offerings.

4. Insuring that Center graduate students are directed toward research in parts of the continent for which the Center can properly prepare them, linguistically and culturally.

Center for Jewish Studies

The Center for Jewish Studies is healthy and active, marked by able leadership, solid external support, and growing enrollments.

I. Program

The Center's undergraduate certificate and baccalaureate degree programs are based upon a curriculum of offerings in history, language, literature, and religion. It sponsors a wide range of lectures and special events and a study abroad program at Israel's Tel Aviv University.

II. Faculty

There are no faculty positions, as such, in the Center, although it is actively supported by five faculty who are members of cooperating departments, a lecturer in Hebrew, and two adjunct lecturers. Three of the faculty are tenured and two are assistant professors. They all seem active as scholars and teachers. However, the loss of two faculty positions during 1990-91, in religion and in Hebrew language, is of concern. Restoration of at least one of those positions (in Hebrew language studies) is essential to the Center's continuing intellectual growth.

III. Students

Student demand for Center courses and programs seems high. Semester credit hours and enrollments (including participation in the Center's certificate and degree programs) have grown steadily over the last five years. The quality and morale of students is high.

IV. Facilities and Resources

The facilities and resources assigned the Center are, with one

notable exception, adequate to its needs. The Price Library of Judaica is a well-managed, major research collection which supports the Center's current needs. Continued development of the Price Library is certainly in the best interests of the University and the Center.

The University provides the Center with a full-time secretary, office space, and a modest expense budget. Of these, the office space is no longer adequate to Center needs; it needs at least one additional office.

V. 1986 BOR Program Review Recommendations

The University and the Center have effectively met the recommendations of the 1986 BOR Program Review.

VI. Conclusions

A. Strengths and Concerns

The Center's strengths are the quality of its faculty and leadership, its effectiveness in acquiring external funding, and the richness of its library resources. The consultants' concerns include the inadequacy of the space assigned the Center, and its recent loss of two faculty positions, (particularly the Hebrew language position).

B. Recommendations

1. Improvement of the Center's facilities through the assignment to it of space for at least one and preferably two additional offices.

2. Restoration of the recently lost faculty line in Hebrew language and linguistics.

Afro-American Studies Program

The University of Florida's Afro-American Studies program's principal purpose is to develop throughout the University's programming, an understanding and appreciation of the historic and continuing contribution of peoples of African origin to the development of American society. A pronounced lack of resources for and an apparent lack of administrative and faculty (beyond that associated with the program) interest in Afro-American Studies has reduced the program to a level of near impotence and left it unable to meet even the minimal responsibilities which should be expected of it.

I. Program

The Afro-American Studies program attempts to support an undergraduate certificate program using course offerings in cooperating departments in the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Fine Arts, and Business, and four introductory and core courses, and two senior seminars which it controls.

II. Faculty

Assigned to the program is one faculty position. Seven additional faculty in the departments of anthropology, English, history, and sociology support the program. That the Program continues to function with a measure of integrity is a credit to individual faculty commitment and professional largesse.

III. Students

Student enrollment in the program's few regularly offered courses while limited is solid. Enrollment growth may reasonably be expected if the program is able to provide additional courses and reasonable continuity in offering them.

IV. Facilities and Resources

Facilities and resources assigned the program are inadequate to existing program needs, not to mention a fully functioning program, and are inappropriate for a university of national standing. The program has no secretarial support. In 1989-90 its total OE/OPS support was $3,500, and in 1991-92 its total allocation for library acquisitions was $2,000.

V. 1986 BOR Program Review Recommendations

None of the 1986 BOR Program Review recommendations have been implemented. The 1986 review noted that: "faculty were frustrated to the point of impotence;" the program was "understaffed;" there was a lack of institutional commitment; and a need for administrative leadership. Recommendations that the university support the program in a variety of ways have not been acted on. Of particular concern is the neglect of recommendation #7: "The college should engage in a planning process with the faculty and students interested in this program to identify the appropriate activities and level of support for the program." The condition of the Afro-American Studies program contradicts the University of Florida's stated profession of commitment to the national educational agenda in support of cultural diversity.

VI. Conclusions

A. Strengths and Concerns

The primary strengths of the Afro-American Studies program are the commitment of its faculty, the diversity, vigor and overall quality of the University's student body and its African-American students, in particular. Of special concern to the consultants is the moribund character of the program and the University's complete disregard of the 1986 BOR Program Review recommendations.

B. Recommendations

1. An immediate University decision to vitalize its Afro-American Studies program and to establish a committee of students and faculty committed to Afro-American studies with a mandate to produce, in time for incorporation into the University and College planning budgets for 1992-93 or 1993-94 at the latest, a five year plan for development of the program, its curriculum, and its faculty and library resources. A necessary element in that planning should be: augmentation of faculty and administrative strength through an external, national search for a new, energetic and visionary program director.

Center for Greek Studies

The Center for Greek Studies has an active core faculty with solid external support from the Greek community in Florida.

I. Program

In its support for the study of Greece, the program is unique in the southeastern United States and one of a small number of such programs in the United States. The program is largely classical and not modern in its resources and programming. It does include modern Greek language courses in the Department of Classics, a team-taught core course, "Greece Yesterday and Today," study abroad programs in Poros, Athens and Thessaloniki, and outreach activities throughout the state. The center has proposed both major and minor degree programs for undergraduates.

II. Faculty

The center has no core faculty of its own, drawing its faculty in large part from the Departments of Classics and History. Aside from its one historian, an outstanding young scholar, none of the faculty have a primary research interest in modern

Greece, although their commitment to the Center is evidenced by their participation in the teaching of its core course and in their support for its fund-raising and outreach activities. Further development of the Center and of its programs is dependent upon the acquisition of a faculty position committed to the teaching of modern Greek language and literature.

III. Students

Enrollment by students of good quality and commitment in the program's modern Greek language courses and in its "Greece Yesterday and Today" course suggest that the present strong student interest in Greek Studies may be expected to grow as curriculum options expand.

IV. Facilities and Resources

The Center's facilities and resources include the library holdings available to it which, while modest, are adequate to its current and projected short-run needs. Significant is the fact that a considerable proportion of the resources upon which the Center depends are met from the income on its $200,000 capital endowment. The level of support the University provides, beyond the endowment income is very modest.

V. 1986 BOR Program Review Recommendations

The University and the Center have corrected the weakness of the Center's programming in history and in its library resources, improved its communication with students, and brought its resources and programs more closely into the academic mainstream. However, the University has not satisfactorily rewarded (matched) the Center's most recent successes in increasing its endowment. It has not provided the program with a faculty position in modern Greek language and literature and no certificate or degree structures have been established.

VI. Conclusions

A. Strengths and Concerns

The Center for Greek Studies' greatest assets are the quality of its faculty, the solidity of its student support, and its success in attracting and maintaining external funding. The consultants' concerns include the Center's lack of a full-time faculty position committed to the teaching of Modern Greek language and literature and the small number of faculty whose

primary research interests are in modern Greek studies.

B. Recommendations

1. A faculty appointment (position) in modern Greek language and literature is a must for the Center's continuing viability.

2. University investment in the Center's infrastructure (increasing its secretarial and expense support) is highly desirable (perhaps as a match to its external support acquisitions).

3. The development of undergraduate certificate and baccalaureate programs and particularly the last should not be considered until at least the above recommendations have been met.

Center for Florida Studies

The Center for Florida Studies supervises an undergraduate certificate program, directs the University of Florida Oral History program, which has received both external and internal funding, and supports the publication of the Florida Historical Quarterly. It also acts as an information resource for a variety of state and other agencies.

I. Program

The Florida Studies program is based in the Department of History, which provides the bulk of its students, but it draws curricular components from anthropology, geography, geology, political science, religion, and a number of units outside the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

II. Faculty

The Center is run essentially by two faculty, one of them its director, the other the coordinator of its certificate program. Eighteen other faculty members from various departments participate in the certificate program.

III. Students

Enrollment in the Center's certificate program is numerically modest.

IV. Facilities and Resources

The Center enjoys ample library support, a full-time secretary,

two graduate research assistants, one each dedicated to the Florida Oral History Project and the Florida Historical Quarterly. Occasional additional secretarial support appears to be project specific. Housing for the Center seems to be a problem, and several of its adherents complained about its cramped quarters and relative "invisibility."

V. 1986 BOR Program Review Recommendations

The Center for Florida Studies was not included in the 1986 BOR Program Review.

VI. Conclusions

A. Strengths and Concerns

The principal strengths of the Center are the quality and longevity of its leadership, and the apparent value of the services it provides to the state and other agencies. Of concern to the program review consultants are the narrow base of faculty and student support for the Center, and an impending leadership change (in what is, frankly speaking, largely a one-person show, impressive as such but unimpressive as a challenging agency of intellectual activity).

B. Recommendations

The Center should be merged with the American Studies program or phased out of existence as the present director retires. If the latter recommendation is adopted, adequate provision should be made for sustainment of the Florida Oral History Project and the editorial management of the Florida Historical Quarterly since both are of considerable continuing value to the University and the State.

Asian Studies Program

The Asian Studies program at the University of Florida provides a good, if somewhat uneven, undergraduate level coverage of China, Japan and India. Of these, the first two are considerably better covered than the last. As a major research University, Florida is far behind its competitors in Asian -- particularly East Asian -- Studies, a major growth field. The Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences is well aware of these circumstances and seems willing to develop Asian studies as resources and opportunities allow.

I. Program

Well taught courses in Chinese and Japanese language (through the third year level) and literature, Chinese history, Chinese and Japanese film studies, and the economy of Japan comprise the primary elements in the Asian Studies baccalaureate degree program. It also includes a modest number of courses treating India. The program is essentially an East Asian Studies program and probably should be so-named. As such, (and in any case) it is deficient in its languages segment; Chinese and Japanese should be taught through the fourth year. Required to do so is an additional faculty line for language and linguistics (or literature). The absence of Japanese history is a critical matter; a faculty position in that area is a must. The program should also include course work in politics and art history and additional course work in economics; required, therefore, are three faculty positions (one each in political science, art history, and economics). Course work in cultural anthropology or sociology could be substituted for the last.

II. Students

The undergraduate students enrolling in the program are generally high ability, genuinely committed and thoroughly engaged students. Those interviewed by the consultants were surprising in number (as compared with students from other area programs) and were articulate and knowledgeable.

III. Faculty

A highly qualified and talented young faculty service the Asian Studies program. They are committed, very able teachers and developing scholars. Investment in them and their programming capacities will serve the University very well.

IV. Facilities and Resources

The Asian Studies program, as such, lacks any semblance of facilities or budget; it is a dependent appendage to the Department of African and Asian Languages. Likewise, it enjoys no support staff. It's leadership, supporting services and office space are provided by a young faculty already encumbered with a full load of teaching, research and service responsibility. A modest space, faculty time, and operational funding investment in the program is a must.

The library resources available to the program are few but useful. Acquisitions funding, particularly for material in

Japanese and Chinese, is too limited and should be increased, and a computer terminal serving the faculty and students of Japanese, Chinese and Korean, linking them to Asian collections nationwide or at least region-wide is essential.

V. 1986 BOR Program Review Recommendations

The recommendations of the 1986 BOR Program Review consultants have only partially been realized. The Asian program still lacks adequate leadership (direction) time, and operational and library funding.

VI. Conclusions

A. Strengths and Concerns

The primary strengths of the Asian Studies program are its young, committed and talented faculty and its comparable student enrollees. Of concern to the BOR Program Review consultants are its lack of language, history, politics, and art history dimensions, and its inadequate facilities and resources including library resources.

B. Recommendations

1. Appointment effective 1992-93 (or at the latest 1993-94) of a director for the Asian Studies program (at least 25% of full-time) from among its present faculty, assignment of an office to the program, assignment (1992-93 or 1993-94) to the program of an annual operating expenses budget of at least $3,000, and assignment (1992-93 or 1993-94) to the program of at least $2,000 in student clerical wage support funds.

2. Extension over the next two years (1992-94) of the program's language program to include fourth year Japanese and Chinese instruction with allocation to the program of a faculty position for that purpose.

3. Advancement of the library acquisitions budget available to the Program faculty in $2,000 (or greater) annual increments over the years 1993-94 - 1999-2000.

4. Allocation to the program of a position in Japanese history in 1993-94 for appointment in 1994-95.

5. Allocation to the program of a position in political science in 1994-95 for appointment in 1995-96.

6. Allocation to the program of a position in art history in 1995-96 for appointment in 1996-97.

7. Development of a long-term development plan (five to seven years) for the Center, one encompassing the above recommendations and providing for eventual necessary programmatic coverage in cultural anthropology or sociology; and the College of Business. The central feature of that plan should be focusing and strengthening the University of Florida's Asian Studies effort, probably as East Asian Studies, directed at delivery of undergraduate enrichment courses and a major program.

American Studies

The American Studies program at the University of Florida is an undergraduate baccalaureate program presently enrolling about twenty majors in course work concentrated in the Departments of History and English. It has a southern American culture focus which is altogether appropriate.

I. Program

The American Studies program is comprised of courses taught essentially in the Departments of English and History.

II. Faculty

The faculty in the American Studies program are a nationally and internationally recognized community of scholars whose productive scholarship -- classroom and research -- graces the Academy as a whole. They are quite capable of supporting graduate study (within established English and History graduate programs or a free standing program). Should they opt to do so, they should be encouraged.

III. Students

The undergraduate students in the American Studies program are sufficient in number and, apparently, in quality.

IV. Facilities and Resources

The library resources supporting the American Studies program are exceptionally well-developed and ample. The program lacks a budget for operational expenditures, and does not, as such, occupy any space. Its occasional administrative and operational expenses are apparently met from funds provided from the Department of History's budget.

V. 1986 BOR Program Review Recommendations

Among the four recommendations developed by the 1986 BOR Program Review consultants, only one, calling for the replacement of outstanding faculty, has been met. The program's courses have not been expanded, the governance of the program remains unidentifiable apart from the Department of History, and a graduate program has not been developed.

VI. Conclusions

A. Strengths and Concerns

The able faculty, the exceptional library resources and a vital group of undergraduate majors are the American Studies program's essential strengths. The consultants' concerns (as was true of their 1986 counterparts) are with the limited, virtually unidentifiable resources supporting the program; its lack of administrative and spatial identification and structure; its nebulous leadership; and its lack of, but very obvious capacity for, graduate programming. The Program works exceptionally well as an undergraduate effort, produced by a committed and exceptionally accomplished faculty.

B. Recommendations

1. Until and unless the faculty responsible for the program argue any of the consultants concerns strongly and more or less consensually, well enough should be left alone.

2. An exception to the above is the possibility of absorbing the Florida Studies program as its director retires, especially the Florida Oral History Project and the Florida Historical Quarterly. Both are worthy enterprises which should not be lost. Resources assigned to both should accompany them in the absorption process (certainly not transferred without adequate supporting resources).

3. The SUS and the University should make the program available as a System lead unit for the more modest programs on the University of South Florida and Florida State University campuses.

Soviet and East European Studies

The Soviet and East European Studies undergraduate certificate program is limited in scope and all but academically untenable. Although student enrollment in the program is increasing, faculty resources are inadequate. Major investments in faculty

positions (five to seven) and library resources; at least modest outlays for minimal administrative and operational expenses; and spatial identity would be required to elevate the program to a viable level.

Despite the importance of student course work in Soviet and East European studies and the lack of expertise and programming in that area in the State University System of Florida, the consultants' reluctant conclusions are that the Soviet and East European Studies undergraduate certificate program should be phased out unless solid commitments of resources to its development can be made over the long-term (resurrection of such a program will -- given the requirements a major research University must meet in faculty and student recruitment, library development, etc. -- require a minimum of ten years).

West European Studies

Despite the presence of able, accomplished faculty in the disciplinary areas and adequate supporting library resources relevant to West European Studies, the undergraduate certificate program isn't functioning. An absence of any real programmatic identity, little apparent faculty or administrative commitment or student interest, and no administrative or operational budget or spatial identity leave the University of Florida's West European Studies program a paper pronouncement. Barring a reversal of attitudes and interests by faculty, administrative officers and students, the West European Studies certificate program should be dropped.

Florida State University

Area Studies in General

Florida State University boasts ten study abroad programs including two centers operated for the State System, and not a single area studies program which can be described as well supported or fully creditable.

Regrettably, the University -- excepting one of its parts, the College of Social Science, has neglected, if not actively discouraged area studies and, in so doing, has rendered its international programming academically impotent. Those programs -- all undergraduate or certificate programs -- are Asian Studies, Latin American and Caribbean Studies, American Studies and Russian and Eastern European Studies. Of these, American and Asian Studies are reasonably strong, and Russian and Eastern European Studies is approaching that level. Latin American and Caribbean Studies is not really viable. The University could, and should, support at least one and probably two fully operational internationally oriented programs offering undergraduate and graduate programs (at least one to the master of arts degree level) in other world areas.

Area Studies in Particular

Asian Studies

A bright beacon in an otherwise rather dismal international studies scene at the Florida State University is its Asian Studies program. Ably led and enthusiastically served by a relatively young faculty, that program is certainly one of two of the University's reasonably strong area studies programs and probably is the strongest Asian Studies Program in the SUS of Florida.

I. Program

The Florida State University System's only graduate degree (an M.A.) in Asian Studies is offered by Florida State University's Asian Studies program. Also vested in that program are a baccalaureate degree (B.A.), and a very promising undergraduate Asian Studies - Business major, the latter supported by the Multinational Business Operations Undergraduate major in the College of Business. The Asian Studies program's course offerings are focused on East Asia (China and Japan), but include some which address India (Southeast Asia). Disciplinarily, these courses are distributed through anthropology, history, religion, political science, art history, economics and Chinese and Japanese languages and

literatures. Insufficient among these offerings are those in languages and literatures, Chinese is regularly offered in a three and one-half year sequence, and Japanese, in a two and one-half year sequence. An additional one-half year of Chinese and one and one-half year of Japanese are available on a Directed Individual Study program. Unsatisfactorily covered are, in addition, Chinese politics, modern Chinese history, Japanese sociology, Japanese economics, and Japanese and Chinese literature.

The Asian Studies program, administratively housed in the College of Social Sciences, is directed by a nationally known, vigorous young Japanologist whose responsibilities, in addition to his faculty teaching, research and service activities, include direction of the Russian and Eastern European Studies program. The director is assisted in the governance of the program by an active Faculty Policy and Curriculum Committee. The Asian Studies program, despite its weaknesses, is Florida State University's strongest and most promising internationally oriented area studies program. The Center and College leadership (dean and director) are both exceptionally able and realistic, and both enjoy the essential leadership quality of vision.

II. Faculty

The core faculty serving the Asian Studies program number eleven (two of whom are India specialists). They are assisted by five other faculty who give the program a part of their time (one of whom is a part-time faculty member in Chinese economics). The scholarly visibility of the faculty is not great, but it is an engaged and potentially productive group. Given appropriate support and recognition, both of which they are now receiving in much greater measure than five years ago (or apparently at any time in the recent past), they could acquit themselves very well. They must receive, however, more of both and their numbers must be increased as suggested in the foregoing and in the conclusions below.

III. Students

The number of student's enrolling in the program's baccalaureate and master's programs is small but increasing thanks to the vitalization of the program described elsewhere in this report. A large number of students majoring and minoring in other, particularly undergraduate, programs are enrolled in the program's courses, however, especially those on Japan and China. The program is serving, therefore, a comparatively large number of the University's students.

IV. Facilities and Resources

The library resources supporting the program -- particularly its dominant East Asian dimensions -- are few but useful. Materials produced outside Asia are relatively ample; those produced in Asia and Asiatic languages are few. Included is a small research collection, (East Asian) which was developed in the 1960's but which has been left untended since. A reasonable and continuing acquisitions budget should be developed to insure the viability of the program's undergraduate and, particularly, its graduate work. The latter is not -- as things stand (faculty expertise, language and other course offerings and Japanese and Chinese language library resources) really viable.

The Dean of the College of Social Sciences is providing some operational funding on a cash demand basis to the program, has provided it with a shared office, and is providing necessary released time for a shared director (with Russian and East European Studies). Needed, as both the Dean and Director are well aware, is a regular operating budget and some form of regular clerical staff support.

V. 1986 BOR Program Review Recommendations

The 1986 BOR Review consultants encountered a dismal and discouraging area studies situation at Florida State University. A few of their recommendations have been at least tentatively realized as is noted in the support provided the program by the Dean of the College of Social Sciences.

VI. Conclusions

A. Strengths and Concerns

Thoughtful, realistic and vigorous leadership by its Dean and Director and an engaged and promising faculty are the Asian Studies program's greatest strengths. The consultants concerns are with the program's lack of adequate, continuing operating, clerical and library acquisitions budgeting; its lack of faculty expertise and course coverage in several areas; and the threat posed its instruction (especially graduate) by those shortages.

B. Recommendations

1. The Dean of the College of Social Sciences should be given a special University allocation of funding, perhaps in staged segments over the next five or so years, to develop Asian (and Russian and East European studies) along the lines of his and

the program director's plans for international studies which, by the way, should, thereby, be adopted by the University, along with the 1986 Report of an Ad Hoc Committee on Planning for International Education, and the suggestions cited in the foregoing paragraphs of this report. The Dean's mandate should be to make the Florida State University's Asian Studies program an academically viable, nationally competitive undergraduate and graduate program (to the level of the M.A. at least). A general, fiscal design for the program might meet the following time table:

a. 1992-93 - $10,000 to $20,000 for operating, clerical and related support.

b. 1993-94 - $50,000 faculty positions and library acquisitions.

c. 1994-95 - $100,000 faculty positions and library acquisitions.

d. 1995-96 - $150,000 faculty positions and library acquisitions.

e. 1996-97 - $115,000 faculty positions, faculty salary enhancement, inter-University cooperative programming and library acquisitions.

These steps would produce new resources for the program in a configuration which might sum as:

Faculty Positions - $290,000
Library Acquisitions - $20,000
Operating Support - $20,000
Clerical Support - $15,000
Faculty Salaries Enhancement $40,000
SUS-Cooperative Programming $60,000

2. The Asian Studies program should be focused almost exclusively on East Asia, China and Japan and eventually, perhaps, Korea, and the program should be renamed accordingly and given its own separate identity.

3. The program should be assigned its own offices.

Latin American and Caribbean Studies

In contrast to the University's two other area studies programs with an international perspective, its Latin American and Caribbean Studies program is limited to a very narrowly (too narrowly) focused undergraduate degree program and, more significantly, it is in most respects a program in name only.

Oddly enough, the University boasts a Florida-Costa Rica Institute, a study abroad program in Costa Rica, and it operates a branch campus in the Panamanian Canal Zone, none of which are identified with, or apparently support the Latin American and Caribbean Studies Program.

I. Program

Located in the College of Arts and Sciences, the program is tended more or less by a nominal faculty coordinator who has suggested -- with a sense of utter frustration -- that it be transferred to the College of Social Sciences. He does so despite the fact that the program's undergraduate major rests almost exclusively upon course offerings in Spanish and Portuguese language, literature and linguistics (an abundance) and in history (some).

The program has no office, no operating budget, no functioning faculty program or policy committee, no non-instructional activities, and few, if any, ties to University faculty and programming outside the Arts and Sciences concerned with Latin America or the Caribbean.

II. Faculty

Outside of the Departments of History and Modern Languages and Literatures, there are few faculty (especially in the Social Sciences) with Latin American or Caribbean interests and expertise. With the exception of one or two (one in history in particular), the program's faculty do not enjoy research-publication profiles sufficient to sustain any more than a limited undergraduate program.

III. Students

Enrolled as majors in the program are an annual average (over the last several years) of seven. This year the program also enrolls about seven minors. Several of this year's majors are engaged in research projects on Latin American political issues. Large numbers of students majoring and minoring in other programs enroll in the Latin American and Caribbean offerings in history and Spanish and Portuguese languages and literatures.

IV. Facilities and Resources

As noted in the foregoing, the program as such has no resources or facilities worthy of the name. The library resources

available to the program are similarly sparse, inadequate even for an undergraduate program. Needless to say, the program does not receive a library acquisitions budget.

V. 1986 BOR Program Review Recommendations

The one 1986 Program Review recommendation directed at the Latin American and Caribbean program has by no means been realized nor have the other general recommendations which are applicable to it.

VI. Conclusions

A. Strengths and Concerns

Aside from a few faculty who are clearly very able and productive, and some students of similar character, the consultants were unable to identify strengths in the Latin American and Caribbean Studies program. The program is lacking in essential scholarly, fiscal, and physical resources.

B. Recommendations

1. As things stand, the Latin American and Caribbean Studies program is not viable. The University and its College of Arts and Sciences should, therefore:

a. Drop its Latin American and Caribbean Studies program as a program and encourage disciplinary departments (modern languages, history, and in the social sciences: political science, sociology, economics, and anthropology), to sustain Latin American content courses and degree tracks as appropriate and as circumstances allow

or

b. Develop a long-term plan for development of a substantial, undergraduate Latin American and Caribbean Studies program firmly anchored in the Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Social Sciences. That plan should evidence resource (library particularly) and curricular ties to the other strong SUS programs, i.e., the University of Florida, Florida International University and Florida Atlantic University. The last might serve as a model for the development plan.

American Studies

Florida State University's American Studies program is located in the College of Arts and Sciences. It's course offerings and

non-instructional activities reflect a clear cultural and humanistic emphasis. It's faculty are presently developing an encompassing focus on Florida and the Southeast in their research and instruction. The program is well run, enjoys a good internal and not a bad external reputation.

I. Program

Offering bachelor of arts and master of arts degrees, and a track in the Humanities doctoral program, the American Studies program is rooted in courses in history, literature, and religion but includes offerings in other disciplines. It is a small but effective program.

II. Faculty and III. Students

The faculty associated with the American Studies program are engaged, productive scholars who are concerned, and rightly so, with focusing the program's research and instructional activities. Their students -- while few in number -- appear to be able and engaged.

IV. Facilities and Resources

The library resources supporting the program are extensive and rich. It is supported by a modest but extremely important operating budget and offices assigned by the College of Arts and Sciences. Those resources are supplemented by restricted support from the Department of Religion. All in all, the resources and facilities available to the program are niggardly but sufficient.

V. 1986 BOR Program Review Recommendations

It is not clear whether or not the one 1986 Program Review recommendation directed at the American Studies program has been realized or not. The consultants assume it has not.

VI. Conclusions

A. Strengths and Concerns

The American Studies program is a small, but academically sound program which deserves to be sustained. Should the University of Florida's Florida Studies Program be phased out and its American Studies program (and the University) be unwilling to continue the Florida Oral History Project or the Florida

Historical Quarterly or both, Florida State and its American Studies Program might consider acquiring one or both.

B. Recommendations

1. The program should be sustained with at least the level of operational support and facilities it presently enjoys.

2. The program's director should be given at least a 25% (and preferably 50%) of full-time appointment as director.

Russian and Eastern European Studies

Like the Asian and Latin American Studies programs, the Russian and Eastern European Studies Program was left neglected, wanting and declining for a number of years. Recently, it has been vitalized and is now progressively being strengthened. Its Russian language and literature program is particularly noteworthy.

I. Program

Like the Florida State Asian Studies program, its Russian and Eastern European Studies Program is administratively housed in the College of Social Science. Its director is the Japanologist who directs the Asian program, and it is served by a faculty policy and curriculum committee which assists its director in its governance and development. There is some interest in developing a Russian and Eastern European Studies - Business major such as already exists in the Asian Studies program. Again, like its Asian counterpart, the Russian and East European Studies program was allowed to fall into decline but is now being rejuvenated by the Dean of the College of Social Sciences and its new Director. It offers a bachelor of arts degree program as well as the only master of arts degree program in Russian and East European Studies in the SUS.

The program is served by graduate and undergraduate courses in history, economics, political science, Russian language and literature, and Serbo-Croatian language. The well-taught, four year Russian language sequence and the several Russian literature courses available to students strengthen the program considerably. Useful as auxiliary work for the program's majors but of considerable value to the Program's service instruction and outreach activities are the one year and summer intensive Serbo-Croatian language offerings. Unfortunately, not included in the program -- for want of faculty expertise -- are courses in the arts, anthropology, sociology, and religion. Faculty expertise in languages and literatures is also more limited than it should be; as it stands the program is

essentially a Russian Studies program.

Also serving the outreach and service activities of the program but peripheral to its degree programs is the well-funded (by the University through the Provost's Office) Yugoslav Center and Exchange program. The well-heeled character of the Yugoslav Center stands in stark, by no means unnoticed, contrast to the dire limited financial circumstance of the Program as a whole.

II. Faculty

The faculty, who are (with their student majors) the heart of the Russian and Eastern European Studies program, number ten (one of whom, a historian, also serves the Asian Studies program). They are tenured in the Departments of History, Economics, Political Science and Modern Languages and Literatures. As a group they are a committed and intellectually lively community of scholars; their research and publication productivity levels are, however, below the level expected in most comprehensive universities and well below that expected in major research universities.

III. Students

Enrollees in the program's undergraduate major and graduate degree tracks are relatively few in number but are increasing as the Program receives additional support. The program's students appear to be of good to very good quality. The program's courses, particularly those of Russian content, are comparatively heavily enrolled and may be expected to be even more so as additional resources are provided to support and extend them.

IV. Resources and Facilities

Recently, the Dean of the College of Social Sciences broke a long cycle of neglect and poverty for the Russian and Eastern European Studies Program with provision of a shared (with Asian Studies) office, part-time director, and a modest ad hoc operating budget. These basic resources and facilities, while still below minimal requirements for a viable program in a comprehensive university, have quickened and strengthened the program immeasurably.

The library resources available to the program, while not ample, are sufficient to its undergraduate instructional component and serviceable for its graduate component. The acquisitions budget for the program should be regularized,

however, and the acquisitions should be focused (on Russian and perhaps Serbo-Croatian materials).

V. 1986 BOR Program Review Recommendations

The University and particularly, the College of Social Sciences have begun to meet some of the recommendations of the 1986 Program Review consultants. The College has met on an ad hoc basis, the resources and facilities recommendation; the University has spoken to a small part of the leadership recommendations but not the essence thereof. The program has not met (and should have) the Yugoslav House (now Center) integration recommendation. The sum of it is, that aside from the efforts of the Dean of the College of Social Sciences, the University administration has generally left the 1986 recommendations unimplemented.

VI. Conclusions

A. Strengths and Concerns

The strengths of the Russian and East European Studies program are its well-developed and delivered Russian language and literature offerings, the entrepreneurial and leadership skills of its present director, and its faculty's capacity for sustained engagement with their subject matter and students. The BOR consultants' concerns include: the program's limited faculty resources, the ad hoc character and minimal extent of its operating and space resources assigned, and its faculty's failure to rigorously and qualitatively focus their teaching, scholarly research and publication.

B. Recommendations

1. The modest operating budget and facilities assigned the Russian and East European Studies program on a shared basis with the Asian Studies program should be regularized and augmented by at least 50% and preferably 100%. The University should provide the College of Social Sciences with the funding necessary for that augmentation. The amount of funding required is small; its use as proposed will yield very worthwhile results.

2. Funding from the Provost's Office for the Yugoslav Center and Exchange program should be made a part of the Program's general operating budget, and the Center and Exchange should be integrated with the program's instructional and non-instructional activities.

3. Plans already formulated by its Dean and Director for

the long-term development of the program should be implemented by the Dean, the program's Director and faculty, and the University Provost's Office in consultation with the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The University should provide the funding needed in a series of staged commitments beginning in 1992-93, if possible, and in 1993-94 at the latest. The increments should be delivered in their entirety by 1998-99. Included should be strengthening the language program (one faculty position in Russian) as proposed by the Department of Modern Languages, with additions over time to the program's curricular coverage and faculty expertise particularly in the areas of sociology and/or anthropology, the arts, and religion. Consideration should be given to limiting the program to Russian Studies and <u>one</u> additional sub-area only unless the University is suddenly blessed with extraordinary resources. In fact, a considerably strengthened Russian program and nothing else should be considered.

4. A determined effort to elevate the quality and extent of faculty research and publication activities should be undertaken (a University supported, bi-College incentive program of modest grants, of time and funding for delivery of results might be in order).

Florida A & M University

Area Studies in General

Area Studies in general have gone minimally tended, if tended at all, by Florida A&M University. Considering its special character and history, and even its size, the University must be judged negligent in those areas. Not one fully functional internationally oriented studies program is available to the University's 8,000 plus students. Surely, the University System and the University should move with all possible haste to develop a strong African-American studies initiative. It should be qualitatively able to lead the System's universities in that area of intellectual inquiry. So, too, should both move promptly to develop at least one strong, internationally oriented undergraduate area studies program.

African-American Studies Program

The African-American Studies Program at Florida A&M University is a broad based and interdisciplinary baccalaureate degree (B.S.) program comprised of courses in history, geography, political science, psychology, economics, literature, sociology, music, and the fine arts.

I. Program

The program content has a strong African and African-American history base, supported by a core of other courses from the humanities and social sciences. It is thoroughly integrated into other programs in the humanities and social sciences but does not have, at this time, enough visibility, spatial or otherwise, to warrant expansion. The program lacks a process for community college articulation, identifiable linkages with the University's foreign language programs and its program in West Africa, or the business school (or the business community).

The program, which focuses on ethnic diversity with a major emphasis on African-American culture, has graduated only one student over the last three years.

II. Faculty

The African-American Studies program faculty are insufficient in number to fully staff the courses in the program. They comprise, however, its single strength. They are impressive in

their commitment to teaching and counseling, generally experienced and active in some professional growth activities. Two or three enjoy regional professional visibility. Overall, their scholarly work is uneven; their enthusiasm for it is not. They are as individuals very active in community service, but their efforts in that area are apparently not linked to the program or perceived as a part of it.

III. Students

The program has had relatively few majors over the past five years. It lacks visibility, internal or external.

IV. Facilities and Resources

Classrooms used by the program are generally satisfactory, its computer facilities are state-of-the-art, and its library (with its own African-American Studies Collection) and archival resources are adequate. It desperately needs maps, its own -- even part-time -- secretary, an operating budget and permanent offices.

V. 1986 BOR Program Review Recommendations

Two of the eleven recommendations of the 1986 BOR Program Review have been met; an African-American content course has been made a part of the University's general education curriculum. That course is, however, largely limited to material drawn from the social sciences and history. Missing, for example, are the riches of African-American music, literature, and dance.

VI. Conclusions

A. Strengths and Concerns

The program's principal strengths are an experienced, committed faculty, a library computer, and audio-visual (instructional) facilities and resources. The consultants are concerned about the program's lack of visibility, both internal and external; adequate space; clerical assistance and operating funds; faculty resources, particularly in the language, literature and arts areas; faculty research and publication; and needless to say, students.

B. Recommendations

1. The University administration should immediately

(effective 1992-93) provide a sufficient operating budget (no less than $2,000 annually) for the African-American Studies program.

2. The University administration should immediately (effective 1992-93) provide an identifiable office or suite of offices for its African-American Studies program.

3. The University administration should restore (effective 1992-93 or at the latest 1993-94) the .5 FTE released time for the director and the .5 FTE in secretarial support specifically designated for the program.

4. The University should ask the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences to appoint a Task Force on African-American Studies which includes, among others perhaps, the chairs of the departments represented in the program, faculty from within and without the program, a representative from the SUS administration and student representatives. The Task Force should address the aims, goals, and objectives of the program and how they can best be achieved in a realistic timeframe, as well as what the external and internal roles of the program should be. The Task Force might also decide whether to integrate the program and the Black Archives, and whether it can and should serve as a model and leadership agency for African-American studies in the SUS.

University of South Florida

Area Studies in General

The USF mission statement within the 1988-93 SUS Master Plan noted a commitment to internationalizing its campuses through formal exchanges for teaching and research with foreign universities, to foreign study/travel programs, to international centers for research, and to minority student/faculty recruitment and retention. The University is deficient in area studies programs, domestic or international in orientation.

African & African-American Studies Program

The University of South Florida's African and African American Studies program was established in 1969 to address the needs and issues raised by the African-American students at the height of the Civil Rights Movement. Administratively, the program is an autonomous, degree-granting program within the College of Arts and Sciences. Its original mission gave it three purposes: teaching, research and public service. The first purpose has been partially served. The second and third purposes have been served only minimally. Serious scholarly research has been limited to two tenured members of the program faculty. It is clear, in fact, that until a vigorous and committed acting director was appointed this last Fall, the program had steadily declined to a near moribund state.

I. Program

The University of South Florida's African and African-American Studies program, insofar as its stated curricular structure is concerned, compares favorably to many others around the country. Designed to provide quality education to students working towards a Bachelor of Arts degree, the curriculum purports to offer a number of courses which are relevant and useful. Internally, however, the program is perceived by many faculty in traditional disciplines as not rigorous enough. That negative perception has discouraged faculty participation in the program and has made it difficult for the program and its faculty to attract students. It probably has fed on issues of course content, grading practices, or faculty qualifications and accomplishments, or all three. Whatever the case, the task before the program's acting director, its faculty, and College and University administrators is to strengthen the program's courses, and, through faculty recruitment and retention practices, to secure a greater measure of effective teaching

and research.

II. Faculty

The African and African-American Studies program is served by a faculty which as of this fall is so small as to be virtually non-existent. Over the last decade or so, the numbers of faculty who have been lost without being replaced has been excessive, suggesting that the program has failed to effectively recruit, and, therefore, to retain faculty. The program has not been able to compete successfully with other departments whose faculty enjoy stability and continuity and its numbers have rendered impossible any serious and meaningful impact on the University community. Limited by their small size and expected to prepare students majoring in the field of African and African-American Studies without adequate support or resources, the faculty of the program simply have not been able to cope.

III. Students

The students who met with the consultants were articulate, responsible, and generally pleased with the manner in which the program served them. Their views were reinforced by the alumni who took time to meet with the University consultant. Clear was the strong concern about the survivability of the program and the need for the administration to know that this academic unit played an important part in their self-development. The statements of the alumni demonstrated that the program guarantees the average graduate the much needed intellectual and psychological tools to survive in the challenging and highly competitive world of corporate America.

Unfortunately, the program has not attracted many majors and will not until it has a sufficiency of faculty and other resources, and until the problems of faculty stability and continuity, and of course work perceived as weak are effectively addressed. It is indeed encouraging to hear top officials of the University say that they welcome cultural pluralism on their campus and are willing to do what it takes to create a better and healthier cultural environment for its student population.

IV. Resources and Facilities

The program is wanting an operational budget worthy of the name, computing equipment, copiers and even typewriters. While the library currently subscribes to five major periodicals which deal with the African and African-American experience,

library resources are inadequate as they stand, and a further infusion of resources is needed.

V. 1986 BOR Program Review Recommendations

The first recommendation in the 1986 program review was that the University address the program's anomalous administrative arrangement. The situation described in that report no longer obtains. The program was placed, along with several other units, in the newly created Division of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences. As the University consultant sees it, the University's commitment to the program will be evident only when it is elevated to the status of a department with its own chairperson. The lead consultant differs slightly in that he sees a strong Center with a dynamic director and able faculty who enjoy joint appointments in the Center and academic departments as an option. With respect to the second recommendation of the 1986 review, the current consultants concur with its proposal that the University authorities establish some sort of incentive for hiring African-American (and minority, in general) faculty. This is an urgent matter because the only way to strengthen the program is to secure faculty with strong credentials. In their third recommendation, the 1986 consultants urged the University to consider the addition of an ethnic or multicultural requirement to the University's basic general education requirements. The USF General Education Council is currently in the process of developing a new general education curriculum in which issues of gender, race, and culture are incorporated. The fourth recommendation in the 1986 review referred to "the impression of indifference of the alumni." This shortcoming is being addressed by the program's acting director and if the responses the current university consultant received from the alumni are representative of the general feelings of the alumni of the program, then it is no longer a problem. The last recommendation of the previous reviewers deals with the general perception that the program is not important. That recommendation may be superseded soon by the administration's renewed commitment to strengthen and support the about-to-be created Department of African and African-American Studies.

VI. Conclusions

A. Strengths and Concerns

The strengths, in fact, the only factors which are preventing the Afro-American Studies program from complete collapse are the determined commitment of the University's relatively new Provost and Dean of its College of Arts and Letters to sustain the program and the energy, commitment and very promising

leadership of its newly appointed acting Director. All else is either insufficient, ineffective, almost inactive (faculty) or absent (operating budget, etc.).

B. Recommendations

1. The University and College Administration should declare in unequivocal terms the commitment to the re-development of a viable African and African-American Studies program and to course work in that area which will constitute part and parcel of the university-wide integrated curriculum for general education.

2. The Provost and the Dean of the College should solici. a long-term (preferable ten year) plan for the re-development of African and African-American Studies from the program's acting director and such interested faculty as may be appropriate. That plan should include:

a. a clear statement of the academic character and mission expected,

b. an administrative (department, center, program or other) design,

c. staged (one position per year given the dearth of faculty to assist with recruitment) faculty recruitment and curricular development,

d. an operating budget and space commensurate with the needs of a viable instruction, research and service unit.

3. The present acting Director of the program should be encouraged to consider appointment as director (or chair) for at least a five-year term during which the above recommended planning is undertaken and whatever is planned is implemented in its first stage or stages.

4. An acquisitions budget should be established for the development of a satisfactory Africana collection in the library, perhaps -- if necessary -- incrementally over five or so years, i.e., $2,000 each year to a budget in 1996-97 of $10,000 or so.

American Studies Program

American Studies at the University of South Florida is a troubled program. Its faculty has been reduced by one-third since 1986; hence, there has been a reduction of the courses it is able to offer. This circumstance has led to questions about

the program's viability in the offices of the Dean and Provost. High enrollments in the program's Gordon Rule courses have helped arrest overall enrollment decline but are turning the program into a service unit and jeopardizing its ability to accommodate its majors and graduate students. The program is reducing its service courses and is attempting to rebuild its enrollments.

I. Program

The undergraduate and the graduate components of the American Studies program comprise a felicitous combination of structure and flexibility, in-depth critical analysis and comprehensive generality. The curricula are at once unified and progressive and they culminate in capstone seminars featuring interdisciplinary methodology and research. Enrollees in the graduate program have the option of taking an internship course (AMS 6940) that gets them out into the community for training in professional careers related to their program in American Studies. They finish with a thesis and an oral examination.

An independent assessment of the master of arts program in 1990 by Professor Eric J. Sandeen, Director of American Studies at the University of Wyoming, affirmed its quality but, recognizing the limitations imposed by cuts in faculty positions and the lack of funding for graduate assistantships and other necessities, recommended an "enhanced M.A. degree" to be achieved over the next four years with reconsideration of a Ph.D. program in 1995. The 1991-92 campus consultant Professor Rex Burbank agrees with Professor Sandeen's assessment; the lead consultant, however, disagrees. That recommendation, based on careful analysis of the current program, is no longer viable in his judgment. The reductions sustained by the Department since 1986, and the impact they have had on faculty and student morale and, therefore, attitudes and capacities, suggest that consideration should be given to abandonment of the graduate program in favor of a stronger undergraduate program. The lead consultant does not find the critical mass of faculty sufficient to a satisfactory graduate program.

II. Faculty

Three of the program's four regular faculty hold doctorates in American Studies, the fourth in English. Student evaluations, both written and oral, of all four professors rate them as demanding but fair, and skillful in the art of leading class discussions. All four have received recognition in the form of grants, teaching and scholarship awards, Fulbright lectureships (the director has had two), invitations to deliver papers at professional conferences, and editorship of special editions of

scholarly publications. Their professional stature, individually and as a group, is promising. They should be encouraged to sustain their scholarly work. Morale among the American Studies faculty is very low.

III. Students

The most recent data on the numbers of students graduating with a baccalaureate degree in American Studies indicate that there were four in 1987, four in 1988, and seven in 1989. Nine students were admitted to the undergraduate program in the fall of 1989 and six were enrolled. The numbers of students completing the master of arts degree for those years were 0, 1, and 2 respectively. The Graduate Director reported in August, 1990, that five students were admitted for fall, 1990, and four candidates were nearing completion of the degree. Enrollment reports on individual courses that include non-majors as well as majors show impressive numerical strength, as did the Gordon Rule courses. These latter, of which the Department had two, have been sharply curtailed in size and number of class offerings -- out of concern that the Department was in danger of being reduced to a service function -- with a resultant sharp loss of student credit hours.

The Department faculty is aware of the need to boost enrollments and has taken steps to do so. At the graduate level, a brochure explaining the program has been completed and is being distributed.

IV. Resources and Facilities

The University librarian and his fellow librarians have done a commendable job in bringing together what must be one of the better small collections of its kind.

The Department's offices and operating budget appear sufficient to its needs.

V. 1986 BOR Program Recommendations

The recommendation of the 1986 BOR Program Review consultants (that establishment of a doctoral program be considered) was not met and, in the judgment of the 1991-92 lead consultant, should not have been. It was unrealistic in 1986 and certainly is even more so in 1991.

VI. Conclusions

A. Strengths and Concerns

The primary strengths of the University of South Florida's American Studies program are its vital, relatively young, and very promising faculty, and its deserved reputation for exciting, substantive and often very creative instruction, particularly at the undergraduate level. Aside from the resources and facilities which support it, and the overall character and quality of the instructional program it produces, practically every aspect about the program deeply concerned the consultants. Of special concern are its administrative status, the morale and number of its faculty, and the extent of its programming.

B. Recommendations

1. Serious consideration should be given to placement of the American Studies faculty in an umbrella unit for interdisciplinary programs, a unit or division that might also include Humanities and Classics and ultimately perhaps other interdisciplinary programs.

2. The program's undergraduate core should be revised slightly, placing AMS 3210, "Regions of America," among its undergraduate electives and replacing it in the core with a forthcoming introductory course.

3. Efforts to boost the program's undergraduate enrollments should be redoubled.

4. The program should delay, until the University's budgetary situation improves, its efforts to secure faculty positions lost some years ago. Perhaps as early as 1993-94 it might request a position to fill its need for an art historian/ folklorist or a specialist in ethnic studies; and, if warranted by appropriate enrollment and programmatic development, it might request the second of its "lost" positions shortly thereafter.

5. The lead consultant suggests that the program faculty and the College of Arts and Sciences consider abolishment of the graduate program in American Studies and concentration of their efforts on a strong undergraduate program. The campus consultant suggests that the Department postpone its plans for a Ph.D. program and heed the recommendation of Professor Sandeen that it bend its efforts toward an "enhanced M.A." over the next four years.

6. The University administration, in its announced curriculum development policy of "integrative approaches," i.e.,

integration of instructional components on race, class, ethnics, and values into general education courses, should enlist the active participation of the American Studies faculty in helping to design the courses and in lending their experience and expertise to that effort.

Florida Atlantic University

Area Studies in General

Internationalizing its programming is cited as a University goal in the SUS Master Plan. Most faculty interviewed by the consultants did not perceive internationalizing the curriculum as a major University goal. That goal has been served almost exclusively by the Dean of the College of Arts and Humanities until very recently (the new Dean of the College of Social Sciences is now moving to serve it) and by the President and the Provost who have just appointed a new Director of International Studies.

The University's only internationally oriented program worthy of the name is its underfunded but very promising Latin American Studies program; its only other area studies program is its Women's Studies program (an exceptionally well-developed and promising program which enjoys very able leadership and consistently strong support from the Dean).

The Latin American Studies program is located in and has received most of its support from the Dean of the College of Arts and Humanities (the new Dean of the College of Social Science will, the consultants suspect, be equally supportive over time, and the University's Provost and President have indicated a desire to be more supportive of international and area studies).

Area Studies in Particular

Latin American Studies Program

I. Program

The Latin American Studies program at Florida Atlantic University is a small but impressively well-developed undergraduate program. It is served by a generally young and vigorous faculty and serves a promising group of students whose numbers are steadily increasing. The program is a loosely structured organization built around a group of undergraduate courses in history, literature, geography, anthropology and literature all with Latin American content. Students who complete the prescribed curriculum (eighteen hours of courses plus sixteen Spanish language hours) are awarded a Certificate in Latin American Studies.

All students enrolling in the Latin American Studies

Certificate program must complete a minimum sixteen (16) credits in Spanish, while native Spanish speakers must take two courses especially designed for native speakers. The consultants urge the eventual addition of courses in Portuguese to complement the growing strengths in Spanish.

Resources include not only a dedicated core of faculty members, but also the University's geographic placement in a region with a dramatic growth in its Hispanic population, many of whom are affluent. New faculty members (especially one each in language and linguistics, and in history), the possibility of renewing efforts (that failed earlier) to collaborate with the College of Business in creating a Latin American curriculum, and the continued strong support of the Departments of History and of Languages and Linguistics are all positive factors. The Dean of the College of Arts & Humanities supports the program and is quite actively promoting interdisciplinary activities. The new Dean of the College of Social Sciences is equally devoted to exploiting the good resources already available in the Latin American area.

The program is caught, however, in the classic conundrum of area studies programs: everybody seems to support it, but nobody -- to now -- has been willing to give it an administrative budget or a budget for library resources. The resources available to it to date -- such as they are -- have been scraped together in the untiring efforts of one individual, the program's first and only Director, and the generous goodwill of its contributing faculty members. The Director runs the program out of his small faculty office with no budget, no clerical assistance, and no released time.

The program has no formal overseas exchange or study programs, although several faculty members over the years, notably in art and in anthropology, have taken students abroad. The consultants believe the art program in San Miguel de Allende (Mexico) conducted annually might be <u>the</u> building block for creating a network of relationships between the University and Latin America. A professor in anthropology has offered field trips to Mexico and Peru over the past five years and his experience and contacts are invaluable. The consultants were informed by the new Director of International Programs that the University was on the point of negotiating an exchange relationship with a Mexican university in Guadalajara.

The University's President mentioned the concept of pursuing a "niche" for the program and spoke of science and engineering -- as well as business -- as possible areas, especially interfacing with local business corporations such as IBM. This area could be one of tremendous growth for the University and the program, a good point of contact with the business community, and a point of departure for developing the program

into one of national stature.

The program includes little outreach to the community and no joint degree or curricular programs -- such as with the College of Business. A new initiative has just been launched, however, to create a "specialization" in Latin America for business majors.

The program is at a crossroads. It has a small, but good, faculty base and enjoys goodwill in the University, especially in the College of Arts and Humanities and the College of Social Science. To make the program truly viable, it desperately needs a resources boost from the University's administration.

II. Faculty

Nine full-time faculty members form the core of the Latin American Studies program, although some others have teaching and/or research interests in the area, and a number of adjunct professors have filled in gaps in the past.

The core faculty represents a sensible cross section of disciplines: two in geography, two in anthropology, one in political science, two in literature, and two in history. The program's director holds a joint appointment in Latin American history and literature. He enjoys an excellent reputation among his peers, nationally and internationally, while the other program faculty have clearly established (or, as young faculty are establishing) good to strong records in their respective fields as well.

Recent faculty appointments in history and languages and linguistics have considerably strengthened the program, while all concerned (the Chairs of those two departments, and the Dean of the college) very forcefully indicated (see below) that faculty hired in the future will also be Latin American specialists. Brazilian history, for example, is among the priorities being considered by the History Department.

The relationship between the faculty of the program and the foreign language program is close. In fact, the newest faculty member in the Department of Languages and Linguistics is a specialist in comparative studies with an emphasis on Latin America, and the Chairman of the Department indicated that one more Latin Americanist will be hired in the near future.

III. Students

Although frequently hampered by the relatively low number of course offerings per semester, enrollment in the Latin American

Studies program has increased slowly over the years. There is a demonstrated interest in the area of Latin America on campus.

Eight students have received the Certificate in Latin American Studies since the inception of the program in 1981, and some of these have continued in the field. One is a doctoral candidate in Latin American History at Tulane University; another is pursuing graduate study at Thunderbird International University.

Hundreds of students, on the other hand, pass through the program's Latin American content courses during the school year.

IV. Facilities and Resources

The Latin American Studies program does not enjoy an operating budget, office space or staff. The Library resources upon which it depends are meager. A line item allocation of between $5,000 and $10,000 has been made available for Latin American Studies materials since 1989, however, and some materials have been acquired. Continued programmatic development and -- most important -- faculty retention depend upon adequate library resources. The program also suffers the want of a modern, interactive, multipurpose language laboratory. The language programs serving the program and the University as a whole are weakened by its absence.

V. 1986 BOR Program Review Recommendations

Florida Atlantic University's Latin American Studies program was not included in the 1986 BOR Program Review.

VI. Conclusions

A. Strengths and Concerns

The program's principal strengths are its young, engaged, and able faculty, and the commitment by University administrators to provide the resources necessary to move it forward.

The ingredients for a viable program are available, and the will and commitment on the part of major administrators (the President, the Provost and, especially, the Deans of the Colleges of Arts and Humanities and of Social Sciences) was made clearly evident to the program reviewers during the site visit. The President stated that the University wishes to grow in Latin American Studies and to get serious about International programs, especially Latin America, given the

location and the urban nature of the University. The Provost commented that the question is not whether the University wishes to be involved in Latin America, but how much and what form it should take.

The consultants are concerned, however, that a promising faculty built with care over several years will continue to be neglected as a programmatic group and that the program which is theirs will languish for want of modest supporting resources and visibility.

B. Recommendations

The first recommendation is critical. It is a step the institution needs to take to give the Latin American Studies program credibility and the staying power necessary to pursue its mission. The remaining recommendations are directed at nurturing the program.

1. Strengthen the Latin American Studies program and provide it stability and permanence by making institutional commitments and structural changes including:

a. Appointment of a Program Director who enjoys and gives to the program 50% of his or her full-time assignment.

b. Establishment of a policy committee comprised of members drawn University-wide to assist the Director in administering the program.

c. Assignment to the program, effective 1992-93 or at the latest 1993-94, of an operating budget of at least $5,000 and a half-time secretary.

d. Assignment of office space to the program (perhaps in the old Humanities Building once it is renovated after the construction of the new Schmidt School of the Arts and Humanities).

2. Establish as promptly as possible a modern, interactive, multipurpose language laboratory.

3. Increase library resources made available for Latin American acquisitions to a minimum annual amount of $10,000 and consider hiring a Latin American bibliographer -- even part-time -- for the library.

4. Pursue a joint degree or Latin American Studies concentration with the College of Business (already initiated through a memorandum from the Director to Center faculty dated September 11, 1991, proposing a specialization in Latin American Studies for business majors).

5. Give consideration to upgrading the Certificate in Latin American Studies to a major or sustain the first and create the latter along with a minor.

6. Establish University sanctioned and operated study abroad programs and/or exchange relationships to serve the program. The long-standing summer program in San Miguel, Mexico is a natural starting point.

7. Consider establishing and funding (perhaps through private sector gifts) a program to bring a Latin American specialist once or twice a year (such as a business leader, statesman, literary figure, etc.) to lend the program needed visibility and vitality and to expose the campus community to distinguished Latin Americans.

8. The Director and Program Advisory Committee should consider initiating a film and/or speaker series for the program.

9. The Program Director and its Advisory Committee should promote the program throughout the campus, i.e., address the visibility, or better, the "invisibility" problem.

University of Central Florida

Area Studies in General

The history of areas studies at the University of Central Florida has been characterized by spontaneity and even impulsiveness, reflecting, perhaps, the rapid growth of a relatively new institution. Each one of its area studies programs -- Canadian, Soviet, Latin American, Asian and Judaic -- developed out of the vision, persistence, and drive of a single individual. Most often, this individual identified a group of faculty interested in teaching or research in a country or world area and petitioned the administration for the establishment of an area studies program. These proposals were ultimately approved, apparently without extensive review of the program's viability, whether the university had adequate resources to sustain the program and intended to commit them to that purpose, and without much consideration as to whether the program would serve a long-range curricular purpose. Now is the time for the University to reflect upon and assess where area studies in general and individual programs in particular fit into its future. The consultants suggest, in that connection, that the internationally oriented area studies programs be grouped under the administrative authority and responsibility of the campus' newly-appointed Director of International Studies, reporting directly to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The consultants also suggest that the Director be held responsible for consulting the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences in the development of any and all programs, and that a small University Area Studies Policy Committee comprising the Director, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and up to four senior, distinguished faculty members appointed by the Provost on the advice of the Director and Dean be charged with advising and assisting the Director and the Dean in the governance and development of area studies programs. In this structure, the programs' academic homes would still remain in their college and departments.

Of the University's five internationally oriented area studies programs, only Latin American Studies, while limited in scope, is academically viable. Soviet Studies and Canadian Studies are long established and inclusive of some admirable elements. Judaic Studies and Asian Studies are new, with the latter being very rudimentary and embryonic. Among these, three probably should be strengthened over the next five or so years in the order cited: Latin American, Soviet and Judaic. The University might consider strengthening at least one of the others (Canadian and Asian) over the long term, i.e., the next ten or so years.

At least one and preferably two of the programs should be fully

developed as undergraduate programs with the long term intention of adding graduate programming (to the master's level only). At present, the best candidates are the Latin American and Soviet programs. At least one and preferably two of the others should be encouraged to develop as strong undergraduate programs with the understanding that they will excel at that level only. The best candidates are the Judaic and Asian programs.

Latin American Studies

The University of Central Florida's Latin American Studies program offers an undergraduate minor program which is academically solid. It is located in the College of Arts and Sciences and is coordinated by a passionate, capable and dedicated senior faculty member whose tenure in the University and oversight of the program is long.

A distinct asset for the program is the mutually enriching, close working relationship which the program's coordinator has established with his counterparts at nearby Rollins College.

The program's faculty and its students feel sorely neglected and unappreciated by the University's administration and -- to a degree -- by the College Officers. Their morale is low.

I. Program

The minor program in Latin American Studies regularly offers a sufficient number of supporting courses in Spanish language and literatures, history, political science, and some other disciplinary areas. The courses are well taught and are very well enrolled. The program is enriched by its relationship with its counterpart faculty at nearby Rollins College, and especially by its resident faculty and student summer program in the Caribbean, a program which should be opened (now limited to majors in anthropology and art) to all the program's minors. Of concern to students in the program is that credit earned through a foreign study program in Spain cannot be counted toward the program's minor. Select credits (but certainly not all) among them probably should be counted; quality of instruction and relevance to the program should be the criteria applied in the selection process. The student argument that French language credits should also count is misplaced. The minor program is not sufficiently broad (Caribbean segments) to countenance the same. In any case a minor in Latin American Studies requires at least Spanish or Portuguese, and both before French, Haitian Creole, Aymara, or other languages.

II. Faculty and III. Students

The program's faculty are in number minimally sufficient to meet the needs of the Program. They are very dedicated, able teachers, however. They enjoy excellent rapport with the students in the program, all of whom feel well-advised and see themselves as integral to the program. Few are engaged in research and publication; some are in other professional activities.

IV. Resources and Facilities

The program enjoys no operating funds, secretarial assistance, released time for its director, or an office. Although the Bryant/West Indies Collection which supports the program is impressive, its library resources are in general meager and inadequate.

V. 1986 BOR Program Review Recommendations

The recommendations of the 1986 BOR Program Review fell on deaf ears; none have in any measure been realized.

VI. Conclusion

A. Strengths and Concern

Latin American Studies is a limited but solidly productive undergraduate minor program which is on the verge of collapse for want of minimal administrative support and recognition.

B. Recommendations

1. The University and the College of Arts and Sciences should immediately commit themselves to strengthening the program. The plan should be developed by the program's director and faculty working under the direction of the Director of International Studies and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

2. A part of the above cited plan should be implementation (as promptly as possible) of the 1986 Program Review recommendations #1 and 2, i.e.,

a. the program should be provided a small annual operating budget of approximately $2,000, and

b. the program coordinator should be administratively recognized with a 25% of full-time appointment as coordinator

or a minimal $500 to $1,000 a year stipend (salary attachment).

3. A development plan for the program should include, in addition, the 1986 Program Recommendations #4 (computerized networking with other SUS Library collections [the University of Florida and Florida International University, in particular]) and a design for strengthening and widening the range of its course offerings over time. It would not be amiss to consider building toward undergraduate major and graduate (to the master's level) programming over the next five to seven years with necessary planned commitments of a library acquisitions budget, released time for a director, additional faculty, etc.

4. In any planned development of the program, encouragement of and appropriate incentives for faculty professional advancement are a must.

Soviet Studies

The University of Central Florida exhibited some wisdom in establishing a focused Soviet Studies undergraduate minor program some years ago. Its wisdom went by the board soon thereafter, however, as the program which was created was -- apparently from the start -- little more than a name on the books at times, and a weak undergraduate minor program much of the time including the present.

I. Program

The Soviet Studies program comprises courses in Russian language and literature, history and political science. Its course offerings are few and not offered as regularly as is desirable, but are fairly heavily enrolled. It has developed over a number of years a working and productive relationship with the Central Florida Russian Circle, a community group, and with the nearby high school which offers Russian language courses. The program faculty are also involved in other promising community activities and conducted a successful Summer Study Tour in Russia in 1991, an effort which should be repeated.

The program lacks regular faculty expertise in too many areas, i.e., sociology, anthropology, the arts, geography, Russian language and others.

II. Faculty

The faculty engaged with the Soviet Studies minor program

number four regular and one adjunct. Their numbers have been reduced over the last several years (positions vacated were not opened to recruitment). One critical problem is the absence of a regular faculty member specializing in Russian language and literature. Courses in these areas are offered by an adjunct faculty member. The program's coordinator is one of its four regular faculty and he is unable to give the program much more than essential attention because he is also involved in the Canadian Studies program and has other administrative and teaching responsibilities.

The research and publication profile of the faculty is low; their teaching and service profiles are, however, relatively high.

III. Students

About twelve students are enrolled in the Soviet Studies minor program this year. They are committed and generally able but are generally frustrated with the program's limited range and frequency of course offerings, and with inadequate advisement by the program's coordinator and its faculty. As suggested above, large numbers of students majoring and minoring in other programs enroll in the program's courses.

IV. Resources and Facilities

The Soviet Studies program is not served by any resources or facilities except a meager, unsatisfactory library collection. Clearly it operates through the good will and generosity of its faculty.

V. 1986 BOR Program Review Recommendations

Of the seven recommendations made by the 1986 BOR Program Review consultants, two have been realized -- a summer study tour in Russia and outreach to the Central Florida Russian community, both the work of the program's faculty. Neither the University or the College of Arts and Sciences acted on any of the other recommendations.

VI. Conclusions

A. Strengths and Concerns

Student interest and a well-developed relationship with the local Russian community are the only real strengths the program enjoys. It is otherwise a weak, neglected program to whom no

real institutional commitment has been made.

B. Recommendations

1. The University and its College of Arts and Sciences should either:

a. take the steps necessary to drop the Soviet Studies minor program,

or

b. commit themselves to the establishment of a viable minor (renamed Russian Studies). Later, perhaps a major program could be established. A long-term (five to seven year) plan for both should be developed in consultation with the program faculty.

2. If the University and the College elect to drop the program, both should aid departments (such as modern languages and literatures, history, political science) and others in sustaining course work addressing Russian studies.

3. If the University and the College commit themselves to the development of a viable minor (and, perhaps, a major) program, a plan for doing so should include at least the following elements:

a) a regular faculty position (and preferably two) in Russian Languages and Literatures.

b) a library acquisitions budget of at least $2,000 the first year, building over five to seven years to a $10,000 minimum.

c) at least two additional faculty positions in two of the following areas: sociology, the arts, anthropology, geography, or history.

d) an annual program operating budget of at least $2,000, an office for the program and its coordinator, and either at least a 25% of full-time appointment for the coordinator or (if only a minor program is to be effectively developed) a modest administrative salary attachment (of approximately $500) for the coordinator.

e) the program should be governed by a coordinator and a faculty policy and curriculum body which is actively engaged in the governance process.

Asian Studies

Asian Studies is one of the University's two new area studies programs. As the self-study developed by the faculty for this Review makes clear, the program is "very rudimentary and embryonic." It is properly focused on East Asia.

I. Program

The program provides an undergraduate minor through course offerings in Japanese and Chinese languages, literatures, history, and political science. The courses it offers are sufficient to the program's embryonic stage, but not to a satisfactory, solid undergraduate program (lacking in both variety and regularity of offering); of particular concern are the courses in languages and literatures.

II. Faculty and III. Students

The faculty serving the program -- including the program's coordinator -- are enthusiastic, able and committed. There are, however, no tenure track or tenured faculty qualified to teach Japanese and Chinese languages and literatures courses; the absence of regular faculty in those areas is a major programmatic weakness. Students enrolling in the courses offered by the program are promising in number, suggesting that enrollment in the minor program may well follow.

IV. Facilities and Resources

The library resources supporting the new program are skimpy and must be at least modestly developed if the program is to succeed. Likewise, the program enjoys no operating budget, compensation in time or administrative salary attachment for its coordinator, or offices. These are compelling measures of the University's capacity and willingness to support its fledgling Asian Studies program.

V. 1986 BOR Program Review Recommendations

The University's Asian Studies program was not included in the 1986 Review; it has emerged since that review.

VI. Conclusions

A. Strengths and Concerns

The energy and enthusiasm of the faculty are the chief

strengths of the Asian Studies program. Practically every other aspect of it is of concern to the Review consultants: faculty numbers and expertise, number and regularity of course offerings, library resources, etc.

B. Recommendations

The University and the College of Arts and Sciences should decide whether Asian Studies is to be satisfactorily developed as an undergraduate minor, and perhaps later, major program. If it is to be so developed, a long-term plan for that development should be designed and should include the following elements: a) Provision of faculty positions (at least 2) in Japanese and Chinese languages and literatures.

b) Provision of faculty positions (at least 3) for appointments in disciplines necessary to the program as defined by the Program faculty.

c) Provision of an annual library acquisitions budget for the program, a budget perhaps beginning at $2,000 a year and building over five to seven years to $10,000.

d) Provision of an annual operating budget for the program perhaps incrementally over five years to at least a level of $2,500.

e) Provision of an office for the program and either a 25% of full-time appointment for the coordinator or a small administrative salary attachment.

f) Consideration of study opportunities in China and Japan for students enrolling in the program perhaps by accessing already established programs at other universities.

g) Consideration of establishing closer ties with local community groups such as the Chinese/American Association of Central Florida and with the University's other units such as the College of Business.

Judaic Studies Program

The Judaic Studies program is new and in a beginning stage. The program has enunciated its purpose as ". . . to enrich the entire cultural life of the Campus, to encourage interdisciplinary dialogue, and to broaden the intellectual atmosphere of the campus. . . ." Thanks to the initiative of the faculty and the program's coordinator, substantial funding for the program has been received from local community benefactors. It is served by a faculty academic committee

(thirteen faculty members) and a community advisory board (thirty members).

I. Program

The Judaic Studies program offers an undergraduate minor and undergraduate certificate both of which are served by a core of courses in history, literature, Hebrew, and religion. Occasional offerings in other disciplines such as political science, philosophy and sociology-anthropology enrich it. The program's language sequence is satisfactory but should be strengthened. The core courses upon which it depends are not offered with regularity. The program does, however, provide significant community service to the Orlando area, including ten major lectures per year.

II. Faculty and III. Students

The program's faculty are enthusiastically committed and able. Their students, although not large in number, are of equal quality and great diversity (ranging from recent high school graduates to senior citizen scholars). Enrollment in the courses supporting the program is reasonable given its relative newness; enrollment in its minor program is promising.

The research-publication profile of the teaching program faculty is developing at a reasonable pace. A few of the faculty are quite prolific. Last year there were two Nobel Laureates included in this group.

IV. Facilities and Resources

Library materials supporting the program have increased but are still insufficient. The program's operating budget is not adequate to its needs, much less to continuing development of the Program. The program's director does not have the benefit of a time assignment as such and should.

V. 1986 BOR Program Review Recommendations

The Judaic Studies program was not included in the 1986 Review; it has developed since 1986.

VI. Conclusions

A. Strengths and Concerns

The program's greatest strengths are its able, dedicated director, its committed, enthusiastic faculty, and its already established community support group. The concerns of the consultants are with the regularity and range of its course offerings, its lack of faculty expertise in some areas, and the limited character of its language offerings.

B. Recommendations

The University and the College of Arts and Sciences should join the program faculty in designing a plan for the program's further development to include:

a) At least a 25% full-time appointment for the Program Director.

b) Annual library acquisitions and operating budgets for the program.

c) Additional faculty expertise (perhaps two positions) serving such areas as folklore, archaeology and the social sciences in general.

d) Regularizing the program's course offerings so they are consistently available to students.

Canadian Studies Program

The University of Central Florida's Canadian Studies program is a mature program initiated a decade ago. It is focused on teaching and outreach; the latter has earned it a national reputation. It is enriched by the Florida/Canada Institute located at the University and by a new summer French language immersion program in Quebec.

I. Program

The Canadian Studies Program offers undergraduate certificate and minor courses of study. Contributing courses to the program are faculty in history, political science, anthropology, French language and literature, and some few others. The program sustains outstanding (one of the top three in the country) Canadian Studies outreach activities directed particularly at elementary and secondary teachers. The program also enjoys productive relationships with local community groups and, especially, with Canadian and Quebec governmental

agencies.

The program's director is an exceptionally dynamic, ingenious officer who has devoted himself to the program for all the years of its existence.

II. Faculty and III. Students

The program is served by a very dedicated group of faculty who teach exceptionally well. The group is not as large as it should be, however, to sustain satisfactory programming. The students served by the program, while not numerous, are an able, committed lot. That their numbers are so few is of concern.

IV. Facilities and Resources

The library resources supporting the program are, in general, barely adequate; the program's office space (as is true for the Florida/Canada Institute) is inadequate and inappropriate. Few institutional resources have been committed to the program on a continuing basis.

V. 1986 BOR Program Review Recommendations

The rather innocuous recommendations of the 1986 Review consultants appear to have been met.

VI. Conclusions

A. Strengths and Concerns

The program's great strengths, and great strengths they are, are its able, committed director, and its outstanding outreach activities. The consultant's concerns include: faculty expertise, faculty and student support for the program, limited library resources, and the lack of institutionally-provided operating support and appropriate office space.

B. Recommendations

1. The University and the College of Arts and Sciences should initiate discussion with the program director and faculty concerning the viability of the program. Although the program is very successful as an outreach agency, it is less than successful as an undergraduate studies program.

2. If the program is to be continued, additional faculty

expertise for it is essential. Presently courses are too few and too infrequently scheduled. The program faculty must give more time to their professional advancement; their research-publication profiles are limited. Also needed are annual library acquisitions and operating budgets and adequate office space.

Florida International University

Area Studies in General

In its commitment to and realization of internationally oriented area studies, Florida International University stands second to only one peer in the State University System, the University of Florida, and it stands second on quantitative not qualitative grounds. With wisdom and foresight, the University's leadership, particularly its President, Provost and select faculty officers concentrated resources on a single area studies program, one well-suited to the University's geographic, political and social placement, and insisted that those resources yield the highest quality possible. Given a few glitches and missteps (some reflected in the recommendations below) their efforts have certainly not been in vain.

Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies

The Latin American and Caribbean Center is the focus of area studies teaching, research and public service at Florida International University. Founded in 1979, it has rapidly grown in size, quality, level of activity, stature and centrality to the mission of the University.

I. Program

The Center's central mission is the promotion of teaching and research on Latin America throughout the University. It does so via a variety of mechanisms including an extraordinarily enriching lecture series; a faculty and student grant program; an impressive publication dimension which includes the new but increasingly important Hemisphere, as well as the academic standard-bearer, the Hispanic American Historical Review (HAHR), edited by the History Department; and vibrant public service events, such as the annual Congressional workshops and Latin American journalists' symposia. Placement of the internationally respected HAHR in the Center is compelling evidence of its nationally recognized quality.

The program's emphasis is on Central America, and during the 1980's Florida International University became the place for conferences, lectures, research and teaching on Central America. In the 1990s it has rapidly moved into a second area, Caribbean Studies. A four-year $375,000 grant from the Mellon Foundation has fueled that development.

A strong Caribbean program is a natural, given the University's proximity to the region and the growing stream of immigrants to the Miami area from the Caribbean. A central component in that program is a new Center sub-division, the Cuba Research Institute.

II. Faculty

All of the Latin American Studies Center faculty have principal appointments in departments or schools. They are scattered throughout the University. Four are in International Relations, four in history (three of whom have international reputations), four in Political Science, and eight in Sociology and Anthropology. Included among them are the President of the University, the Provost, the Dean of the College of Business Administration, the Director of the Center for Labor Studies, and the Chairs of the Departments of Economics, International Relations, and Sociology/Anthropology. There is a great deal of mutual respect and even camaraderie among these officers and their fellow faculty; working relationships are clear and focused around the common goal of increasing support for Latin American studies.

The Center faculty are serious, highly productive, and professionally-oriented. They are making significant contributions to the field of Latin American studies. An important factor in that productivity is their faculty assignments which now include four to five courses a year; appropriate assignments for faculty in a University striving for research university status. To the consultants knowledge, nowhere in the U.S. is there as large and highly qualified a group of Latin Americanists assembled in a university that does not have doctoral programs in the core programs of history, political science, literature and linguistics. Currently, there is a Ph.D. in economics (instituted some five years ago) that hopes to produce its first doctorate this year. Most of the students in the program are working in the Latin American area. A doctoral program in comparative sociology (to be administered in the Department of Sociology/Anthropology) has been approved for feasibility and planning, but the state budget crisis has delayed its implementation. Plans are well advanced for an international relations Ph.D. Senior administrators indicate their willingness to consider and push for doctorates in the remaining social sciences, but also note the enormous pressure to develop doctoral degree programs in a wide variety of other fields and the difficulties in absorbing many new programs over a short period of time. While all of this is true, delays in the development of these doctoral programs will only serve to frustrate the faculty and limit their professional development.

The University should seek funds to establish one or two Eminent Scholars in the Latin American field.

III. Students

In 1990-91, over 5,000 students enrolled in the University's Latin American content courses and some 210 enrolled in the Latin American Studies Center's Certificate Program. Available to those students and those who follow are a wealth of some 143 Latin American content course offerings. The Center's certificate program requires a variety of courses outside the enrollees degree area of focus as well as Spanish language instruction. The result is a student with a broadly-grounded, interdisciplinary knowledge of Latin America resting on a firm basis of strength in one particular discipline.

Among the University's students there is a great demand for a graduate program (M.A.) in Latin American studies. With the exception of the University of Pittsburgh and Cornell University, all other Title VI National Resource Centers offer both B.A. and M.A. degrees in Latin American Studies. The Center and the University should be encouraged to plan for such an M.A. program.

One other option should be considered, and that would be joint professional-master's degree programs. Many institutions are now offering an M.A. in area studies in conjunction with professional degrees (especially in business). In that combination, the professional degree offers the vocational grounding the market demands, but the M.A. can provided in-depth area studies knowledge as an important complement.

IV. Facilities and Resources

The Latin American and Caribbean Center confronts two major problems in its resource and facility base: its office space and its library acquisitions budget. An external evaluator, visitor, or potential donor is left nonplused by the limited office space the Center occupies given its level of activity and national visibility. At the moment a staff of 10 is crammed into 762 square feet, in a rabbit warren of cubicles and tiny, windowless offices. A visitor is left with the distinct impression that the Center must not be high on the University administration's priority list when it relegates it to such poor and crowded office space.

Before the recent cuts, the state budget allocation to the library for the Latin American collection was $15,000. Faculty members in individual departments were able to augment this amount by using their allocations to order materials in the

Latin American field. These funds are difficult to track but probably were double the size of the central acquisitions budget. Between the two sources, therefore, the Latin American collection was probably spending something like $40,000-$50,000 a year before the freeze. The Center has been using its Title VI and Mellon money to increase that budget. Compared to the major Latin American programs, this is a very small budget (the University of Florida had an acquisitions' budget of $151,000 in 1990-91 while that of the University of Pittsburgh was $200,000).

Despite the limited allocations budget, the University has managed to assemble a respectable collection of materials. The collection will be unable, however, to support a full range of graduate programs in the social sciences unless the acquisitions budget for Latin America is dramatically increased. An ancillary problem in the library is the absence of a full-time Latin American bibliographer. While the library has staff who are assigned to the Latin American collection, their responsibilities are divided between reference responsibilities and collecting in other fields. A Latin American bibliographer's position should be defined and filled as the library's highest priority. That individual should be given a sufficient budget to begin major, regular purchases of materials in the area. A goal of $100,000/year in 1991 dollars should be set and a schedule for its realization established.

The creation of the Cuban Research Institute, the closing of the Multicultural and Multilingual Center, and some staff changes within the Center, have produced a number of less-than-full-time clerical administrative positions. Several part-time positions do not yield the equivalent of a full-time position; commitments are divided and responsibilities slip between the cracks. The Center director should have a full-time secretary who has no other responsibilities. Senior staffers in the Center should be able to share a full-time secretary/ receptionist, <u>but one who is full-time</u>. If a master of arts program is developed, a full-time Center advisor will be needed for the students.

V. <u>1986 BOR Program Review Recommendations</u>

For the most part, the recommendations from the 1986 BOR Program Review have been implemented. The Latin American and Caribbean Center reports directly to the provost and is able, thereby, to deal with all areas of the University. A grant was made to the library and acquisitions have improved, but, as noted above, they do not match actual and planned growth. As recommended, a mission statement was developed and a long-term planning process put in place. The expansion in the area of Caribbean studies is a function of that plan. Achieving that

goal also satisfied an additional recommendation, namely that of expanding into non-Hispanic areas of the Caribbean.

Although some progress has been made in meeting the objective of hiring more non-Latin American internationalists, the progress has been limited and is not one with which the present consultants agree. No university can be all things to all people -- knowledge is too vast, the world too large. Florida International University should strive to do a few things very well. It already does Latin American studies very well and should sustain that effort. Finally, only limited improvement between the relations of the Center and its counterpart at the University of Miami have been achieved. The funding of the University of Miami's North-South Center by the U.S. Congress at the level of $10 million/year has not resulted in any expansion of the University's funding. It appears that its efforts to gain access to that funding have not been very successful.

VI. Conclusions

A. Strengths and Concerns

Latin American Studies at Florida International University has, over the course of a decade, become one of the strongest programs in the United States. It joins a distinguished group of about a dozen programs (and consortia of programs) of national distinction at major research universities. Its growth is attributable to unusually strong, capable and sensitive leadership by its director, who has served in that capacity since the Center was established, supported by a young and dynamic faculty and administration.

At the moment, Latin American studies is the intellectual hub around which a great many University faculty and students rotate. It is evident that intellectual energy needs to be captured and made central to the development of the emerging graduate programs in the humanities and social sciences.

B. Recommendations

1. Expansion of the Latin American library acquisitions budget to $100,000 year in 1991 dollars as rapidly as possible, perhaps in $10,000 increments over the next four to five years.

2. Creation of a Latin American bibliographer position in the library by 1993-94, if at all possible, and, if not, by 1994-95.

3. Relocation, as soon as possible but certainly before the opening of the 1993-94 academic year, of the Center offices to

provide at least twice the current 762 square feet of space. At a minimum, the Director must be provided with a suitable office commensurate with his and the Center's status on campus and the Center should be assigned a small conference room.

4. Planning for doctoral programs should be begun in Political Science, History and Sociology/Anthropology at the earliest possible moment.

5. A plan for a master's degree in Latin American Studies should be developed immediately.

6. With the addition of the Caribbean program (and the special research program on Cuba), the Center should avoid extending itself further. It already covers a large part of Latin America, and there are individual scholars whose interests will take them throughout the region. But the emphasis in terms of faculty lines, courses, library budget and conference support should be limited to those areas, since to move more broadly would dilute the limited resources available.

7. Further, thought should be given to the ways in which the University's Latin American and Caribbean Center and its counterpart -- one of the oldest and most respected programs on Latin America in the United States -- at the University of Florida can continue to collaborate. Perhaps a genuine joint effort at library collection could be undertaken. Joint research projects, using Title VI funds might also be considered.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LEAD CONSULTANT VITA

G. Micheal Riley

Abbreviated Résumé

Address: 264 West Lincoln Avenue
Delaware, Ohio 43015

Phone: Home----(614) 363-8016
Office--(614) 292-1882

Personal Statistics: Born, Silver City, New Mexico, April 22, 1934. Wife, Denise A. Riley. Children, Kathleen Shannon (19) and Jennifer Sean (17).

Academic Background:

Degrees:

B.S.: Arizona State University, May 29, 1956
M.A.: University of New Mexico, June 7, 1961
Ph.D.: University of New Mexico, June 4, 1965

Appointments:

1983-: The Ohio State University

Dean, College of Humanities, with line responsibility for twelve Departments and six Centers; and Professor in History.

1974-1983: University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

1978-1983: Associate Dean, Humanities Division, College of Letters and Science and Professor in Hispanic Studies.

1975-1978: Associate Dean, Humanities Division, College of Letters and Science.

1976-1977: Acting Chairman, Department of Linguistics.

1974-1975: Director, Center for Latin America and Associate Professor in Hispanic Studies.

1972-1974: University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and Marquette University: Director, Center for Latin America and Visiting Associate Professor in Hispanic Studies, UW- Milwaukee; Associate Professor in History, Marquette University.

1966-1972: Marquette University: Assistant and Associate Professor (1971) in History.

Summer 1969: N.D.E.A. Institute in History, The College of St. Catherine, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Appointments (continued)

Summer 1967:	N.D.E.A. Institute in History, Loretto Heights College, Denver, Colorado.
1964-1966:	Colorado State University: Assistant Professor in History.
1963-1964:	University of New Mexico: Visiting Assistant Professor in History.
1959-1961:	University of New Mexico: Graduate Teaching Assistant.

Publications:

1975	"The Prototype of the Central Mexican Hacienda: A Sixteenth Century Case" in Enrique Florescano, ed. Haciendas, Latinfundios y Plantaciones en America Latina, Mexico: Siglo Veintiuno Editores, 1975.
1973	Fernando Cortés and the Marquesado in Morelos, 1522-47: A Case Study in the Socio-Economic Development of Colonial Mexico. Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press, 1973.
1972	"Labor in Cortesian Enterprise: The Cuernavaca Area, 1522-1549," The Americas, XXVIII, No. 3 (January 1972), pp. 271-287.
1971	"Land in Spanish Enterprise: Colonial Morelos (Mexico), 1522-1547," The Americas, XXVII, No. 3 (January 1971), pp. 233-251.
1968	"Fernando Cortés and the Cuernavaca Encomiendas, 1522-1547," The Americas, XXV, No. 1 (July 1968), pp. 3-24.

Professional Memberships and Activities:

Membership:

CIC Liberal Arts Deans
Council of Colleges of Arts and Sciences
American Council of Academic Deans
Association of American Colleges
Ohio Council of Deans
Mississippi Valley Council of Deans
American Historical Association
Western History Association
Conference on Latin American History
Latin American Studies Association
Midwest Association for Latin American Studies
North Central Council of Latin Americanists
American Association of University Professors

Professional Memberships and Activities (continued)

Rocky Mountain Council for Latin American Studies
Phi Kappa Phi
Phi Alpha Theta
Sigma Delta Pi

Professional Activities:

Offices and Appointments:

1987- . Secretary-Treasurer, Council of Colleges of Arts and Sciences

1986- . Member, Board of Directors, Council of Colleges of Arts and Sciences (Deans).

1987-88. Chair, Mississippi Valley Council of Liberal Arts and Sciences Deans.

1986-88. Chair, CIC Liberal Arts and Sciences Deans.

1984. Chairman, Nominating Committee, Conference on Latin American History.

1977- . Senior Editor, The Americas: A Quarterly Review of Inter-American Cultural History.

1980-85. Member, Board of Editors, Hispanic American Historical Review.

Community Service (Major Commitments):

Ohio 1983-Present

President's Representative (Ohio State University), City of Columbus 1992 Columbian Quincentenary Planning Committee, 1985-.

Chair, Program Committee, Columbus Rotary, 1987 - .

Vice-Chair, Program Committee, Columbus Rotary, 1986-87.

Member, Columbus Rotary. 1984-.

Member, Metropolitan Club of Columbus. 1983-.

Member, Columbus World Trade Council. 1983-.

Member, Creighton Club (Columbus). 1983-.

Member, Shakespeare Club. Delaware, Ohio. 1984-.

Community Service (Major Commitments) (continued)

Wisconsin 1966-1983

Member, Milwaukee World Trade Council. 1973-76.

Member, Community Board. Milwaukee Humanities Program. 1977-81 (Member, Board's Executive Committee. 1977-80).

Member, Committee on Instruction. Brown Deer School Board. 1978-79.

Fund Raiser, United Performing Arts Fund. 1978-1983.

Fund Raiser, Milwaukee Symphony. 1975-1983.

Member, Milwaukee Contemporary Hispanic Arts Council (Contempra). 1978-80.

Military Service:

January, 1957 - October, 1958 (Commissioned, May, 1956); Company Commander, Instructor, U.S. Army Armor School, Fort Knox, Kentucky. Reserve obligation (active) terminated May 29, 1962. Present reserve rank (inactive): Major.

References:

On request.

0637V
2/20/90

APPENDIX B

AREA STUDIES PROGRAM REVIEW CONSULTANTS

AREA & ETHNIC STUDIES PROGRAM REVIEW

LEAD CONSULTANT

Dr. G. Michael Riley, Dean
College of Humanities
Ohio State University

University Consultants

University of Florida

Dr. Martin Collcutt
Department of Asian Studies
Princeton University

Dr. Donald E. Crummey
Center for African Studies
University of Illinois

Florida A&M University

Dr. Alton B. Hornsby
Department of History
Morehouse College

Florida Atlantic University

Dr. Lawrence A. Clayton
Department of History
University of Alabama

Florida International University

Dr. Mitchell Seligson
Center for Latin American Studies
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Florida State University

Dr. Albert Feuerwerker
Department of History
University of Michigan

University of South Florida

Dr. Sulayman S. Nyang
Dept. of African Studies
Howard University

Dr. Rex Burbank
Department of Humanities
San Jose State University

Univ. of Central Florida

Dr. Richard Beach
Dept. International Studies
SUNY

AREA STUDIES PROGRAM REVIEW
UNIVERSITY COORDINATORS

UNIVERSITY COORDINATORS
1990-91 AREA AND ETHNIC STUDIES PROGRAM REVIEW

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
Dr. Warren Bargad
Director, Jewish Studies
407 Grinter Hall
Gainesville, Florida 32611
SC 622-9247
(904) 392-9247

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
Dr. Winston Lo
Professor, Dept. of History
Director of Asian Studies
435 Bellamy Hall
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
SC 284-5297
(904) 644-5297

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIV.
Dr. Douglas Kincade
Associate Director
Latin American/Caribbean Ctr.
Florida International University
Miami, Florida 33199
SC 441-2894

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA
Denise L. Young, Director
International Studies
Fine Arts Building, Room 209
University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida 32816
SC 345-5375
(407) 275-5375

FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY
Dr. John Schwaller
Assistant Dean
Department of History
College of Humanities
500 NW 20th Street
Boca Raton, Florida 33431
SC 238-3845
(407) 393-3845

FLORIDA A&M UNIVERSITY
Dr. Theodore Hemmingway
Professor of History
History Department
427 Tucker Hall, Room 409
Florida A&M University
Tallahassee, Florida 32307
SC 286-3138
(904) 599-3138 - Office
(904) 599-3374 - Dept.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FL.
Dr. Jack Moore, Chairman
American Studies Dept.
University of South Florida
4202 Fowler Avenue
Tampa, Florida 33620
SC 574-2857

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM
Dr. R. E. LeMon, Director
Program Review
Tallahassee, Florida 32399
SC 278-7702
(904) 488-7702

Dr. Gita W. Pitter
Program Review Associate
Tallahassee, Florida 32399
SC 278-7702
(904) 488-7702